



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

## Early Greek Indexicality

### Markers of Allusion in Archaic Greek Poetry



**Thomas James Nelson**

Trinity College  
University of Cambridge  
September 2018

*This dissertation is submitted for the degree of*  
Doctor of Philosophy



# *Abstract*

## **Early Greek Indexicality: Markers of Allusion in Archaic Greek Poetry**

Thomas J. Nelson | Trinity College | PhD | September 2018

This thesis is concerned with early Greek literary history and the nature of archaic Greek allusion. It examines how our earliest Greek poets self-consciously marked and signalled their interactions with other texts and traditions, often in a deeply antagonistic fashion.

In recent years, scholars have explored how Roman poets signposted references to their predecessors through a range of relational metaphors, representing their allusions as acts of recollection, echo and theft. Yet although these readings have proved a popular and rewarding interpretative approach, such allusive phenomena are often assumed to be the preserve of the scholarly, literate and bookish climates of the Hellenistic and Roman worlds.

In this study, by contrast, I highlight how these very same devices can already be detected in Archaic Greek Poetry, from Homer to Pindar, challenging any simple dichotomy between the orality of Archaic Greece and the literacy of Hellenistic Rome. After an introduction in which I lay out the objectives of my study and address the methodological difficulties of discussing allusion and intertextuality in early Greek poetry, the majority of the thesis is divided into three main sections, each of which addresses a different 'index' (marker/pointer) of allusion in archaic Greek epic and lyric. The first addresses what Latinists call the 'Alexandrian footnote': vague references to hearsay and anonymous tradition which frequently conceal specific nods to precise literary predecessors. The second focuses on poetic memory, exploring how characters' reminiscences of events from their fictional pasts coincide with recollections of earlier literary texts and traditions. The final chapter turns to time and temporality, to explore how Greek poets both evoke and pointedly replay episodes of the literary past or future beyond their immediate narrative. Together, these three case studies demonstrate that the indexing and signposting of allusions was nothing new by the time of the Hellenistic age. What are sometimes considered distinctively learned flourishes of self-consciousness were in fact, I contend, an integral part of the literary tradition from the very start, a key feature of the grammar of allusion with which ancient audiences were already intuitively familiar.



*For my grandparents:  
Colin, Linda, Margaret  
and Derek, in memoriam*



## *Acknowledgements*

This thesis would not have been possible without the help, patience and encouragement of many individuals and institutions. These two pages do little to repay their support.

The research was funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the Golden Web Foundation and the Cambridge Faculty of Classics; I am extremely indebted to all three for their financial backing. The Faculty, alongside Trinity College, also provided travel bursaries which allowed me to attend a number of international conferences, at home and abroad. For specific grants, I am grateful to both the Classical Association and the Venice International University: the former funded a very productive and enriching two-week stay at the Fondation Hardt in Geneva in August 2017 and the latter supported my participation in the Advanced Seminar in the Humanities at VIU in March 2018. For the provision of books and other material, I owe a great deal to the excellent resources and staff of the Faculty of Classics and University Libraries in Cambridge, as well as the Bodleian and Sackler Libraries in Oxford and the Institute of Classical Studies in London.

Many colleagues and mentors have offered feedback, advice and inspiration along the way. Foremost among them is my supervisor, Richard Hunter, who has spent a great deal of time reading drafts and discussing my ideas. I am extremely grateful to him for his guiding hand and his remarkably prompt feedback throughout. Tim Whitmarsh, my secondary supervisor, has offered sound and valuable advice at many stages; his sharp questions have invariably helped me clarify my thinking. My thesis examiners, Renaud Gagné and Felix Budelmann, were also extremely rigorous and generous readers, helping me see where I can take this project in the future. For my formative years in Oxford, I am particularly indebted to Bill Allan, Gregory Hutchinson, Adrian Kelly, Jane Lightfoot and Alan Woolley, all of whom helped shape my approach to Classical literature. And in Cambridge and Oxford more generally, I have benefited from discussion with many other individuals, including Bruno Currie, Ingo

Gildenhard, Stephen Heyworth (whose Latin lectures first got me thinking about markers of allusion), Neil Hopkinson (my college adviser), Daniel Jolowicz, Henry Spelman and Chris Whitton. In addition to offering enriching discussion, many colleagues have also kindly shared unpublished work: Péter Agócs, Anne Harreau (née Clerc), Sophus Helle, Stephen Heyworth, Regina Höschele, Richard Hunter, Adrian Kelly, Rebecca Lämmle, Jason Nethercut, Évelyne Prioux, Henry Spelman, Laura Swift and Philip Hardie (who lent me his copy of Séverine Clément-Tarantino's 2006 thesis).

The graduate community in the Faculty of Classics has made the whole process far more enjoyable and supportive. The weekly graduate tea and graduate interdisciplinary seminar have been highlights of each week. Like the Homeric narrator, I cannot name every individual who has played a role, but my peers in the A Caucus deserve a special mention: Emma Greensmith, Talitha Kearey, Valeria Pace, Henry Tang, and especially Rebecca Lees, a constant support and presence in the common room and on the dance floor. Max Leventhal has also shaped my thinking considerably, with his enthusiastic encouragement and concern for the bigger picture.

Beyond the Classical World, I am particularly grateful to the members of the Cambridge University Dancesport Team and XS Latin Cambridge for their camaraderie and support over many years. Again, many must go unnamed, but I owe a great deal especially to David Mallabone, an inspirational teacher and friend. Vicki Marsh and her team at HeadStart Clinics have also played a major role in keeping my body and mind going in the right direction throughout.

My most heartfelt thanks of all go to my family. My parents Mark and Jacky have been incredibly supportive throughout my studies, as has my brother Matthew. Caitlin has been unstinting in her love and encouragement. And all four of my grandparents have supported and inspired me in more ways than they are aware: it is to them that this thesis is dedicated.



## *Preface*

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text

The dissertation is 80,000 words. It does not exceed the prescribed word limit for the relevant Degree Committee.



# Contents

|                                      |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| <i>Abstract</i>                      | iii  |
| <i>Acknowledgements</i>              | vii  |
| <i>Preface</i>                       | ix   |
| <i>Contents</i>                      | xi   |
| <i>Conventions and Abbreviations</i> | xiii |

## I. INTRODUCTION

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>I.1. Indexicality and Allusion</b>                            | <b>3</b>  |
| I.1.1: <i>Allusion: Greece versus Rome</i>                       | 3         |
| I.1.2: <i>Indexicality: Marking Allusion</i>                     | 5         |
| I.1.3: <i>The Path Ahead</i>                                     | 16        |
| <b>I.2. Frameworks for Intertextuality in Early Greek Poetry</b> | <b>21</b> |
| I.2.1: <i>Mythological Intertextuality</i>                       | 26        |
| I.2.2: <i>Reconstructing Lost Traditions</i>                     | 35        |
| I.2.3: <i>From Myth to Text</i>                                  | 42        |

## II. THE PRE-ALEXANDRIAN FOOTNOTE

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>II.1. Introduction</b>                         | <b>57</b>  |
| <b>II.2. Epic Fama</b>                            | <b>59</b>  |
| II.2.1: <i>The Authority of Tradition</i>         | 62         |
| II.2.2: <i>Contesting Tradition</i>               | 67         |
| II.2.3: <i>The Poet's Voice</i>                   | 76         |
| II.2.4: <i>The Epic Archive</i>                   | 82         |
| <b>II.3. Lyric Fama</b>                           | <b>89</b>  |
| II.3.1: <i>Traditions and Texts</i>               | 90         |
| II.3.2: <i>Suppression and Contestation</i>       | 99         |
| II.3.3: <i>The Poetics of Supplementation</i>     | 106        |
| II.3.4: <i>Lyric Innovation: Faux Footnoting?</i> | 115        |
| <b>II.4. Conclusions</b>                          | <b>121</b> |

### III. POETIC MEMORY

|                                       |            |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>III.1. Introduction</b>            | <b>127</b> |
| <b>III.2. Epic Recall</b>             | <b>131</b> |
| III.2.1: <i>Intertextual Memories</i> | 134        |
| III.2.2: <i>Intratextual Memories</i> | 141        |
| III.2.3: <i>Selective Recall</i>      | 145        |
| III.2.4: <i>Proleptic Knowledge</i>   | 153        |
| III.2.5: <i>Mapping Epic Memory</i>   | 157        |
| <b>III.3. Lyric Recall</b>            | <b>161</b> |
| III.3.1: <i>Meagre Memories</i>       | 163        |
| III.3.2: <i>Mythical Recall</i>       | 165        |
| III.3.3: <i>Audience Knowledge</i>    | 174        |
| <b>III.4. Conclusions</b>             | <b>183</b> |

### IV. TIME FOR ALLUSION

|                                     |            |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>IV.1. Introduction</b>           | <b>187</b> |
| <b>IV.2. Epic Temporalities</b>     | <b>191</b> |
| IV.2.1: <i>Pointers to the Past</i> | 192        |
| IV.2.2: <i>Poetic Déjà Vu</i>       | 198        |
| IV.2.3: <i>Epic Epigonality</i>     | 201        |
| <b>IV.3. Lyric Temporalities</b>    | <b>209</b> |
| IV.3.1: <i>Once Upon a Time</i>     | 209        |
| IV.3.2: <i>Poetic Predecessors</i>  | 214        |
| IV.3.3: <i>Iterative Poetics</i>    | 224        |
| <b>IV.4. Conclusions</b>            | <b>235</b> |

### V. EPILOGUE

|                                       |            |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
|                                       | <b>239</b> |
| V.1: <i>Allusion: Greece and Rome</i> | 240        |
| V.2: <i>A Broader Perspective</i>     | 243        |

|                            |            |
|----------------------------|------------|
| <b><i>Bibliography</i></b> | <b>249</b> |
|----------------------------|------------|

# *Conventions and Abbreviations*

## **Translations**

Where provided, translations are my own unless otherwise indicated. In most cases, ancient names have been Latinised.

## **Formatting**

Within the text, boldface type highlights indexes of allusion; underlining highlights words of interest, especially verbal parallels; the grapheme ~ marks an intertextual relation between different passages.

## **Abbreviations**

Abbreviations of journals generally follow *L'Année Philologique*, except for the occasional shortening (*AJP* not *AJPh*, *BMCR* not *BMCRev*, etc.) and the following additions:

|      |  |
|------|--|
| CSCA | <i>California Studies in Classical Antiquity</i>                     |
| GRMS | <i>Greek and Roman Musical Studies</i>                               |
| JAH  | <i>Journal of Ancient History</i>                                    |
| LICS | <i>Leeds International Classical Studies</i>                         |
| SPAW | <i>Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</i> |
| TC   | <i>Trends in Classics</i>  |

Abbreviations of ancient authors generally follow the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*<sup>4</sup> (Hornblower et al. (2012)). In the case of the *Homeric Hymns* and Callimachus' *Hymns*, I follow the practice of Stephens (2015) xiv: *HhDion*; *HhDem*; *HhAp*; *HhHerm*; *HhAphr* for the major Homeric Hymns (otherwise *Hh.6* etc.); *hZeus*, *hAp*, *hArt*, *hDelos*, *hAth* *hDem* for the Callimachean.

On the following pages are a list of other abbreviations that are employed in the text (a full list of texts and editions used can be found at the start of the bibliography):

- AP *Palatine Anthology (Anthologia Palatina)*
- BNJ Worthington, I. (ed.) (2007– ) *Brill's New Jacoby* (online: <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby>).
- CEG Hansen, P.A. (ed.) (1983–89) *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca* (Berlin–New York)
- D–K Diels, H. and Kranz, W. (eds.) (1951–52) *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*<sup>6</sup> (3 vols) (1903<sup>1</sup>) (Berlin)
- EGEF Tsagalis, C.C. (ed.) (2017) *Early Greek Epic Fragments I: Antiquarian and Genealogical Epic* (TC Suppl. 47) (Berlin–Boston)
- EGM Fowler, R.L. (ed.) (2000–13) *Early Greek Mythography* (2 vols). Vol. 1: *Text and Introduction* (2000). Vol. 2: *Commentary* (2013) (Oxford)
- FGrH Jacoby, F. et al. (eds.) (1923– ) *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker: Text und Kommentar* (Leiden–Boston–Cologne)
- GEF West, M.L. (ed.) (2003) *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Loeb Classical Library 497) (Cambridge, MA–London)
- GDRK Heitsch, E. (ed.) (1961–64) *Die Griechischen Dichterfragmente der Römischen Kaiserzeit* (2 vols). *Abh. Akad. Wissensch. Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Kl. 3*, Folge 49 (1961<sup>1</sup>, 1963<sup>2</sup>), 58 (1964) (Göttingen)
- HE Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L. (eds.) (1965) *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigram* (2 vols) (Cambridge)
- HNP Marjanović, L. (ed.) (1898) *Hrvatske Narodne Pjesme, III: Junačke Pjesme (Muhamedovske)* [*Croatian Folk Songs, III: Heroic Songs (Muslim)*] (Zagreb)
- IEG West, M.L. (ed.) (1989–92) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*<sup>2</sup> (2 vols) (Oxford)
- K–A Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (eds.) (1983– ) *Poetae Comici Graeci* (8 vols). Vol. 1: *Comoedia Dorica, mimi, phlyaces* (2001). Vol. 2: *Agathenor – Aristonymus* (1991). Vol. 3, 2: *Aristophanes. Testimonia et fragmenta* (1984). Vol. 4 *Aristophon – Crobylus* (1983). Vol. 5: *Damoxenus – Magnes* (1986). Vol. 6, 2: *Menander. Testimonia et fragmenta apud scriptores servata* (1998). Vol. 7: *Menecrates – Xenophon* (1989). Vol. 8 *Adespota* (1995) (Berlin–New York)
- LIMC (1981–99) *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (16 vols) (Zürich)
- LfgrE Snell, B. et al. (1955–2010) *Lexikon des Frühgriechischen Epos* (4 vols). Vol. 1: A (Issues 1–9, 1955–78). Vol. 2: B–Λ (Issues 10–14, 1982–91). Vol. 3: M–Π (Issues 15–20, 1993–2004). Vol. 4: P–Ω (Issues 21–25, 2006–10) (Göttingen)

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| LSJ       | Liddell, H.G., Scott, R. and Jones, H.S. (1996) <i>A Greek–English Lexicon</i> <sup>9</sup> (with Revised Supplement by P.G.W. Glare) (Oxford)  |
| OB        | Old Babylonian Gilgamesh  |
| PEG       | Bernabé, A. (ed.) (1987–2007) <i>Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum. Testimonia et Fragmenta</i> (4 vols). Pars I (1987 <sup>1</sup> , Leipzig; 1996 <sup>2</sup> , Stuttgart–Leipzig). Pars II Fasc.1 & 2: <i>Orphicorum et Orphicis Similium Testimonia et Fragmenta</i> (2004, 2005, Munich–Leipzig). Pars II Fasc.3: <i>Musaeus, Linus, Epimenides, Papyrus Derveni, Indices</i> (2007, Berlin–New York)   |
| Perry     | Perry, B.E. (ed.) (1952) <i>Aesopica: A Series of Texts Relating to Aesop or Ascribed to Him or Closely Connected with the Literary Tradition that Bears his Name</i> . Vol. 1: <i>Greek and Latin Texts</i> (Urbana)   |
| PLLS      | Cairns, F. (ed.) <i>Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar</i> (Vols. 1–5, 1975–85); <i>Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar</i> (Vols. 6–10, 1988–98); <i>Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar</i> (Vols. 11–, 2003–)  |
| Pf.       | Pfeiffer, R. (ed.) (1949–53) <i>Callimachus</i> (2 vols). Vol. 1: <i>Fragmenta</i> (1949). Vol. 2: <i>Hymni et epigrammata</i> (1953) (Oxford)  |
| PMG       | Page, D.L. (ed.) (1962) <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> (Oxford)  |
| PMGF      | Davies, M. (ed.) (1991) <i>Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> (Oxford)  |
| SB        | Standard Babylonian Gilgamesh   |
| SEG       | <i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>  |
| SH        | Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P. (eds.) (1983) <i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> (Berlin–New York)   |
| Stallbaum | Stallbaum, J.G. (ed.) (1825–26) <i>Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam</i> (2 vols). Vol. 1: $\alpha - \lambda$ (1825). Vol. 2: $\mu - \omega$ (1826) (Leipzig)   |
| TrGF      | Snell, B., Kannicht, R. and Radt, S.L. (eds.) (1971–2004) <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> (5 vols). Vol. 1: <i>Didascaliae Tragicae, Catalogi Tragicorum et Tragoediarum, Testimonia et Fragmenta Tragicorum Minorum</i> (ed. B. Snell, 1971 <sup>1</sup> , 1986 <sup>2</sup> ). Vol. 2: <i>Fragmenta Adespota</i> (eds. R. Kannicht and B. Snell, 1981). Vol. 3: <i>Aeschylus</i> (ed. S. L. Radt, 1977). Vol. 4: <i>Sophocles</i> (ed. S. L. Radt, 1985 <sup>1</sup> , 1999 <sup>2</sup> ). Vol. 5: <i>Euripides</i> (ed. R. Kannicht, 2 parts, 2004) (Göttingen) |
| VdV       | van der Valk, M. (ed.) (1971–1987) <i>Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes</i> (4 vols). Vol. 1: <i>Commentarii ad Libros A – Δ</i> (1971). Vol. 2: <i>Commentarii ad Libros E – I</i> (1976). Vol. 3: <i>Commentarii ad Libros K – Π</i> (1979). Vol. 4: <i>Commentarii ad Libros P – Ω</i> (1987) (Leiden)  |





# **PART I.**

## **INTRODUCTION**



## I.1 Indexicality and Allusion

### I.1.1 Allusion: Greece versus Rome

Two decades ago, the late Don Fowler set out his vision of the ‘principal tasks’ that lay ahead ‘for future intertextual criticism’. In particular, he pinpointed the need to expand our understanding of early Greek allusion and ‘to apply to Greek texts, especially of the archaic and classical periods, the intensely ideological readings of genre and intertextuality that have proved so successful in Latin studies.’<sup>1</sup> In the past twenty years, scholars have responded to this clarion call with much gusto and have drawn on the interpretative strategies of later periods to highlight the rich intertextual potential of early Greek poetry.<sup>2</sup> Few indeed would now contend (if any ever did) that allusive sophistication is ‘the private preserve of Alexandrian and Augustan poets and their exegetes’.<sup>3</sup>

Yet there remains an underlying fissure in scholarship on early Greek allusion, which revolves around one central question: how similar were the allusive practices of archaic Greece and Augustan Rome? Already in 1997, Fowler remarked that ‘there is no reason why anyone should not use the full tools of detailed intertextual analysis on early Greek texts’ – a sentiment he shares with other scholars who foreground the continuities of literary history.<sup>4</sup> But set against such optimism are voices of caution, those who warn that the oral environment of early

---

<sup>1</sup> Fowler (1997) 28. Key works on this topic in Roman poetry: Conte (1986), (2017); Thomas (1986); Hinds (1998); Pucci (1998); Edmunds (2001). Useful introductions to the theoretical issues surrounding ‘allusion’ and ‘intertextuality’: Clayton – Rothstein (1991); Orr (2003); Allen (2011); Lyne (2016). I am content to use the two terms interchangeably, and do not shrink from talking of a poet’s ‘intentions’, if nothing more than as a heuristic tool: cf. Hinds (1998) 50 on the ‘intention-bearing author’ as ‘a discourse good to think with.’ See too Farrell (2005)’s convincing case for a middle ground between authorial intent and reader response.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Torrance (2013); Currie (2016); Rawles (2018); Spelman (2018a).

<sup>3</sup> Halleran (1997) 151.

<sup>4</sup> Fowler (1997) 31. Cf. Currie (2016) 38. On such continuities: Acosta-Hughes (2010); Nelson (forthcoming a).

Greek poetry precludes the same interpretative strategies available to readers of Latin literature. Robert Fowler's assessment of archaic lyric is typical: 'there are no Virgils here'.<sup>5</sup>

This debate is a complex one and largely stems from scholars' differing theoretical preconceptions. But it is further hindered by scholars' tendency to examine archaic Greek poetry in a compartmentalised fashion: most studies of early Greek allusion focus on a single author, or – at best – a single genre, which limits our ability to chart diachronic developments or investigate similarities and differences in depth. Moreover, the insistent emphasis on the 'if' of early Greek allusion overrides an exploration of the 'why'. Scholars' fixation on proving or denying a case of allusion often usurps consideration of an allusion's interpretative significance, short-circuiting an exploration of the manner in which individual texts construct and contest their inherited tradition. When it comes to understanding the scope, quality and significance of early Greek allusion, there is still much work to be done.

In this study, I will re-examine the nature of archaic Greek allusion by embarking on a track that is both broader and narrower than the usual path. On the one hand, I will explore the development of allusive practices in archaic Greece from our earliest Greek epic poetry to late archaic lyric – offering a broader perspective on archaic allusivity. But to do so, I will focus on one very particular feature of this allusive system: the marking and signposting of allusion, a phenomenon which I call 'indexicality' (see below). Such signalling is often considered the most learned and bookish device in a Roman poet's allusive arsenal. But in this study, I intend to demonstrate that this phenomenon was already deeply embedded in the earliest extant Greek poetry – a conclusion that strengthens the case for deep continuities between the allusive practices of Greece and Rome.

In the remainder of this chapter, I shall survey the recent developments and limitations of scholarship on allusive marking, before turning in the next to outline my methodological approach to early Greek allusion.

---

<sup>5</sup> Fowler (1987) 39. Cf. Kelly (2015a), (forthcoming).

## I.1.2 Indexicality: Marking Allusion

Literary scholars have long attempted to catalogue and categorise the means by which authors may mark – and readers recognise – allusions. In the words of Jeffrey Wills, we are all deeply immersed and trained in a ‘grammar of allusion’, by which we read and interpret allusive references.<sup>6</sup> For ancient Greek and Roman poetry, we can pick out four overarching strands of this ‘grammar’: (i) verbal allusion, the repetition of specific words or phrases, especially if they are distinctive or unusual, e.g. dialectally charged or rarely used (like Homeric *hapax legomena*); (ii) aural allusion, the repetition of specific sonic, rhythmic or metrical patterns; (iii) structural allusion, the use of a similar word order or similar placement of a word or phrase within a line or whole poem; and (iv) thematic allusion, the exploitation of similar themes, contexts or content. Most cases of ancient allusion derive their power from some combination of these four categories, although such a simple, formal list will undoubtedly prove unsatisfactory in some cases, given the varied and nuanced application of allusion.

In addition to these broad over-arching categories, however, scholars in the past few decades have begun to dwell increasingly on a range of more self-reflexive techniques by which ancient and modern poets have signposted their allusive engagements. In the field of English literature, John Hollander has examined echo as a ‘mode of allusion’ in Milton and Romantic poetry, David Quint has explored rivers’ sources as a *topos* of literary debt, and Christopher Ricks has probed the range of motifs by which English poets self-consciously figured themselves as heirs to tradition, exploiting tropes of paternity, inheritance and succession.<sup>7</sup> Inspired by such studies, classical scholars have noted a similarly sophisticated array of allusive markers in Latin literature.

By far the most commonly attested is the so-called ‘Alexandrian footnote’, a device which assimilates literary allusion to the transmission of talk and hearsay: general appeals to

---

<sup>6</sup> Wills (1996) 15-41. In general: Broich (1985); Helbig (1996).

<sup>7</sup> Hollander (1981); Quint (1983); Ricks (1976), (2002). For Echo in European literature generally: Gély-Ghedira (2000).

tradition (such as *fama est*, *ferunt* or *audivi*) often signal an allusion to specific literary predecessors, despite their apparent vagueness and generality. A famous example of this device is the opening of Catullus' *epyllion*, *Carmen* 64, where the *dicuntur* ('they are said') in the second line flags the poem's polemical interaction with numerous other treatments of the Argonautic voyage.<sup>8</sup> A simpler example, however, is that of *fertur* in Virgil's description of the two gates of horn and ivory in *Aeneid* 6, which points back to Penelope's famous description of these very same gates in the *Odyssey* (*Aen.*6.893-96 ~ *Od.*19.562-67). In addition to the verbal and thematic echoes of the Odyssean passage, Virgil's vague appeal to tradition invites his audience to ask where these details have been 'reported' before, an extra spur to recall the legitimising authority of Homer.<sup>9</sup>

For Stephen Hinds, who has done more than any other to publicise this phenomenon,<sup>10</sup> such 'footnotes' are 'a kind of built-in commentary, a kind of reflexive annotation, which underlines or intensifies their demand to be interpreted *as* allusions': *dicuntur* and similar expressions can mean not only "'are said [in tradition]'", but also, more specifically, "'are said [in my literary predecessors]'"'.<sup>11</sup> But it is also worth stressing the variety of nuances that the device can bear in Roman texts. Far from simply marking an allusive debt, it can also highlight a particularly contentious point of tradition. When Virgil claims that Enceladus lies beneath Etna (*fama est*, *Aen.*3.578), he polemically weighs into a literary debate about the precise identity of the giant beneath the mountain. In Pindar's *Pythian* 1, Virgil's main model for this passage (*Aen.*3.570-87 ~ *Pyth.*1.13-28), the giant was Typhon, but in Callimachus's *Aetia* Prologue, Enceladus took his place (*Aet.*fr.1.36) – an inconsistency that was already noted by

---

<sup>8</sup> On Catullus 64's unbridled allusivity: Thomas (1982). On this 'Alexandrian footnote': Gaisser (1995) 582-55; Hinds (1995) 41-42, (1998) 1-2; DeBrohun (2007) 296; Fernandelli (2012) 20 with n.72.

<sup>9</sup> Horsfall (1990) 50, (2016) 114. Horsfall (2016) 111-34 offers a thorough treatment of Virgilian 'footnotes'.

<sup>10</sup> The phrase 'Alexandrian footnote' is usually attributed to Ross (1975) 68, although he only uses it in passing when describing the 'neoteric' nature of Prop.1.20.17's *namque ferunt olim* (with a cross reference to Norden (1957) 123-24). The phrase was later brought to prominence and invested with its current intertextual associations by Hinds (1987) 58 with n.22, (1998) 1-3.

<sup>11</sup> Hinds (1998) 1-2. On *Fama* generally: Clément-Tarantino (2006a) pt.3; Hardie (2012); Guastella (2017).

the Pindaric scholia.<sup>12</sup> In this case, Virgil's *fama est* gestures not only to a single literary source, but rather to a plurality of competing traditions, within which Virgil signals his own solution: 'he simultaneously refers to this *zetema*, and tells us who was right'.<sup>13</sup>

In other cases, meanwhile, hearsay is invoked at points of apparent innovation, where inherited tradition is creatively reworked or completely rewritten. When Virgil claims in the *Georgics* that Aristaeus' bees were lost through sickness and hunger (*amissis, ut fama, apibus morboque fameque*, G.4.318), he seems to be lending the authority of tradition to what is in all likelihood his own invention, further reinforced by the aural jingle of *fama* and *fame*.<sup>14</sup> In the *Aeneid*, meanwhile, Sinon prefaces an untraditional account of Palamedes' genealogy and pacifism with an emphatic assertion of the hero's famous reputation (*Aen.*2.81-83):

**fando** aliquod si forte **tuas pervenit ad auris**  
 Belidae **nomen** Palamedis et **incluta fama**  
**gloria** ...

This insistence on Palamedes' fame lends a legitimising veneer to Sinon's (and Virgil's) untraditional account, but it also invites an audience to challenge the claims that follow, to hone in on their innovations and to dwell on their significance.<sup>15</sup> Such 'faux footnotes' as these are 'a kind of poetic smoke and mirrors',<sup>16</sup> a means for a poet to mark his own creative ability and his own unique place in tradition. Indeed, by presenting such innovations as 'traditional', the poet implies that his own work is co-extensive with the literary tradition: any word he utters is immediately incorporated into the larger web of authoritative *fama*.

The Alexandrian 'footnote', then, is not simply a shortcut to mark literary debts and sources. It is also a polemical signpost of contested tradition, and an authorising signal of

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Σ *Ol.*4.11c; Hunter – Lämmle (forthcoming). It is unsurprising that Virgil's *Fama* prefers the tradition about her own brother (cf. *Enceladoque sororem*, *Aen.*4.179; Clément-Tarantino (2006a) 585).

<sup>13</sup> Thomas (1993) 80; cf. (1998) 116-20.

<sup>14</sup> Thomas (1988) II.203; Horsfall (2016) 130.

<sup>15</sup> Townshend (2015) 78-87. Cf. Adkin (2011) on Virgil's etymological play (*fari/fama/falsus/infandum*).

<sup>16</sup> Townshend (2015) 94.

literary innovation. At its heart, it is a tool of literary self-representation, a means for a poet to position himself against what his predecessors have said and what his audiences have heard – a valuable feature of any Roman poet’s intertextual repertoire.

Besides the ‘Alexandrian footnote’, Latin scholars have also identified a host of other tropes which figure, model and mark allusive interactions. Foremost amongst these are embedded references to memory, repetition and echo. Ovid’s Mars, for example, reminds Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses* of a prophecy he had previously made in Ennius’ *Annals* (*tu mihi concilio quondam praesente deorum | (nam memoro memorique animo pia verba notavi), Met.14.812-13*). The war god’s emphatic juxtaposition of *memoro memori* and his overt appeal to the past in *quondam* help signal the following verbatim quotation of Jupiter’s former words: the god explicitly recalls the earlier Ennian poem (*unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerula caeli, Met.14.814 = Ann.54*).<sup>17</sup> Similar, if a little more implicit, is Ovid’s description of Narcissus’ death in the *Metamorphoses*: Echo’s repetition of the egotist’s words there (*dictoque vale ‘vale’ inquit et Echo, Met.3.499-501*) self-consciously highlights Ovid’s own ‘echoing’ of Virgil’s ‘fading doubled *vale*’ in the *Eclogues* (*Ecl.3.78-79: ‘...vale, vale’ inquit, ‘Iolla’*).<sup>18</sup> The most famous example of this phenomenon in modern scholarship, however, is the speech of Ariadne in the *Fasti* (*Fast.3.471-76*):

**en iterum**, fluctus, **similes** audite querellas.  
**en iterum** lacrimas accipe, harena, meas.  
**dicebam, memini**, ‘periure et perfide Theseu!’  
 ille abiit, **eadem** crimina Bacchus habet.  
**nunc quoque** ‘nulla viro’ clamabo ‘femina credat’;  
 nomine mutato causa **relata mea est**.

<sup>17</sup> Conte (1986) 57-59; Solodow (1988) 227. More on indexical memory: J.F. Miller (1993), (1994); Sens (2003) 306-8, (2006) 157; Fontaine (2014) 183-86; Faber (2017); Iff-Noël (forthcoming).

<sup>18</sup> Hinds (1995) 44 = (1998) 5-6. Other cases of allusive echo: Barchiesi (2001) 139-40; Heerink (2015) 6-9, 63-65; Cowan (2017) 13-17; Nethercut (forthcoming).



As scholars have long noted, Ariadne's words assert a strong sense of literary déjà vu. Abandoned by the god Bacchus, she recalls the similar mistreatment she has received from Theseus in earlier poetry, not only in Ovid's previous treatments of the myth (*Her.*10, *A.A.*1.525-64, *Met.*8.169-82), but also in the ecphrastic account of Catullus' *Carmen* 64 (*Catull.*64.52-266).<sup>19</sup> The accumulation of temporal markers (*en iterum, en iterum, nunc quoque*) and the language of repetition and similarity (*similes, eadem, relata...est*) cue us to see this scene as a self-conscious repeat, alongside the pointed *memini* that precedes her self-quotation: she actually 'remembers' her earlier literary appearance(s).<sup>20</sup> Amassed together, these motifs of memory, iteration and similarity proclaim Ovid's allusive debts. Like the Alexandrian footnote, they are a crucial tool of literary self-representation.

We could spend much time surveying further examples of such self-consciously figured allusions in Roman poetry – indeed, a comprehensive catalogue of the phenomenon, though a Herculean enterprise, would be an extremely useful resource. For now, however, it suffices to note that a range of other self-reflexive tropes have been read in a similar manner in Roman literature.<sup>21</sup> Besides report, echo and memory, scholars have explored the allusive potential of other metaphors, including footsteps, grafting, prophecy, recognition, succession and theft.<sup>22</sup> Any trope, in short, which suggests a relation of dependence or the voice of authority can easily be co-opted as a metaphor of allusive relationships. And even a mere temporal adverb can evoke diachronic literary relationships, as when Ovid's Achaemenides is

<sup>19</sup> Note *periure et perfide Theseu* (*Fast.*3.473) ~ *perfide...perfide...Theseu* (*Catull.*64.132-3), *periuria* (*Catull.*64.135); *nunc quoque nulla viro...femina credit* (*Fast.*3.475) ~ *nunc iam nulla viro...femina credat* (*Catull.*64.143).

<sup>20</sup> Conte (1986) 60-62; Hinds (1995) 42-3, (1998) 3-4; Van Tress (2004) 17-19; Armstrong (2006) 48-51; Nauta (2013) 223-25; Heyworth (forthcoming) *ad Fast.*3.459-516.

<sup>21</sup> Generally, see Hinds (1995), (1998) 3-16; Barchiesi (1995); Wills (1996) index s.v. 'external markers (of allusion)'; O'Neill (1999) 288-89; Clerc (2007) 24-27.

<sup>22</sup> Footsteps: Nelson (forthcoming b). Grafting: Pucci (1998) 99-106; Clément-Tarantino (2006b); Henkel (2014). Prophecy: Barchiesi (2001) 133-35. Recognition: Hinds (1998) 8-10; Nethercut (2018) 78n.12. Succession: Ingleheart (2010); Hardie (1993) 88-119. Theft: Nelson (forthcoming c). Cf. Nethercut (2017) on Lucretius' use of *radices* and *stirpes* to signpost his Empedoclean 'roots'.

‘no longer’ roughly clad, as he had been in Virgil’s *Aeneid* (*iam non*, *Met.*14.165 ~ *Aen.*3.590-94),<sup>23</sup> or when Statius’ Achelous ‘still’ shows the traces of his Ovidian past (*adhuc*, *Theb.*4.106-9 ~ *Met.*9.96-97).<sup>24</sup> Taken together, these phenomena form a nexus of inter-related tropes for figuring and marking allusion. In general terms, they fit into a broader category of metaliterary ‘marking’, standing alongside signals of generic affiliation, etymological play and acrostics.<sup>25</sup> But in their range, variety and adaptability, they stand apart. They may not be as explicit as a modern philologist’s footnotes, but as Jeffrey Wills notes, they ‘function much as quotation-marks do in modern scripts, alerting the reader that some reference is being made, the specific source of which must be deduced in other words.’<sup>26</sup> They offer a useful supplement to the ‘grammar’ of ancient allusion, and it is thus no wonder that they have been taken up with such scholarly vigour in recent decades.

However, modern scholarship’s engagement with this phenomenon of allusive marking is not without its problems. First among these is the indiscriminate and uncritical labelling of examples. Ever since Stephen Hinds opened his seminal *Allusion and Intertext* with these devices, the ‘Alexandrian footnote’ and other allusive markers have become a familiar concept in classical scholarship. They now proliferate in discussions of not just Latin, but also later Greek authors.<sup>27</sup> Yet like a commentary’s ‘cf.’, the identification of footnotes and markers can all too often mark the end of the interpretative process, rather than its beginning. These terms have become a convenient shorthand, avoiding the need for closer engagement with the

---

<sup>23</sup> Solodow (1988) 227; Hinds (1998) 113.

<sup>24</sup> Micozzi (2015) 340-41.

<sup>25</sup> ‘Metageneric signals’: Harrison (2007) 27-33. Etymological markers: O’Hara (2017) 75-79; Cairns (1997); Michalopoulos (2001) 4-5. Acrostic markers: Bing (1990) 281n.1; Feeney – Nelis (2005).

<sup>26</sup> Wills (1996) 31.

<sup>27</sup> E.g. Lucretius: Nethercut (2018). Catullus: Skinner (2003) 162; Gale (2012) 200). Propertius: Heslin (2018) 38-39. Horace: Heslin (2018) 44. Ovid: Curley (2013) 184, 187; Ziogas (2013) index s.v. ‘Alexandrian footnote’. Livy(?): Marincola (2005) 227-28. Philostratus: Whitmarsh (2004) 240, 242. Lucian: ní Mheallaigh (2014) 46-47. Quintus Smyrnaeus: Bär (2009) 12, 57, 77; Maciver (2012) 54-57, 64-66.

details of a specific allusion. What was once an exciting and liberating insight into the self-consciousness and reflexivity of Latin poets now seems a banal cliché.

The uncritical acceptance of these allusive markers is even visible in the very sobriquet which the 'Alexandrian footnote' has received. Given the apparent intellectual demands triggered by such tags, one can understand why Stephen Hinds adopted David Ross' 'Alexandrian footnote' to describe the phenomenon. As he argues, the footnoting which we find in Catullus and elsewhere figuratively portrays the poet 'as a kind of scholar, and portrays his allusion as a kind of learned citation,' 'encod[ing] a statement of alignment with the academic-poet traditions of Callimachus and the Alexandrian library.'<sup>28</sup> In this, he resembles the views of earlier and later scholars: Kirk argues that *φασί* in the Michigan Alcidas papyrus 'smacks of post-Alexandrian scholarship'; Hollis regards *fama est* as 'an indication that we are in the world of learned poetry'; Morrison explores how 'they say' statements in Hellenistic poetry form part of the creation of a scholarly and learned narratorial persona; and Nethercut treats Lucretius' use of the device as evidence of his neo-Callimacheanism.<sup>29</sup> Norden, moreover, distinguishes between earlier Greek and later Hellenistic/Latin appeals to tradition, arguing that only the latter suggest a reliance on a source, whereas the former are simply earnest assertions of the truth of tradition.<sup>30</sup> And Conte, last of all, has seen in Ovid's allusive signposting the 'capacity of Alexandrianism to mirror its art in itself and to revel in its skill', a means for the poet to highlight 'the artifice and the fictional devices underlying his own poetic world.'<sup>31</sup> Allusive 'footnoting', it would seem, is regarded as something distinctively Hellenistic, learned and self-conscious.

Indeed, such a view can be traced back at least as far as the Homeric scholia. When Achilles' horse Xanthus claims that he and Balaus 'could run swift as the West wind's blast, which **they say** (*φάσ*) is the fleetest of all winds' (*Il.*19.415-16), the scholiast complains that it

---

<sup>28</sup> Hinds (1998) 2.

<sup>29</sup> Kirk (1950) 154 (challenged by Renehan (1971) 87-89); Hollis (1992) 273; Morrison (2007a) 122, 274-75; Nethercut (2018). Cf. Faber (2017)'s argument for the Hellenistic origins of indexical memory.

<sup>30</sup> Norden (1957) 123-24.

<sup>31</sup> Conte (1986) 62.

is ‘not believable that a horse would say φασίν as if he were a πολυίστωρ man’ and had ‘acquired it from ιστορία’ (Σ II.19.416-17). The underlying assumption is that this footnoting tag only befits an erudite scholar, such as Callimachus himself, who is elsewhere described with the very same adjective in a life of Aratus (Καλλίμαχου πολυίστορος ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἀξιοπίστου, *test.*79 Pf.). Such scholarly baggage is also apparent in another scholiastic note, when the Homeric narrator claims that the eagle, ‘they say’ (φασίν), ‘has the keenest sight of all winged things under heaven’ (Σ II.17.674-75):

ἀξιοπίστως τὸ φασί προσέθηκεν ὡς πρὸ τοῦ ἐπιβαλέσθαι τῇ ποιήσει ἐξητακῶς ἀκριβῶς ἅπαντα. **bT** φησὶ δὲ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ὡς ἴστησι τοὺς νεοσσοὺς πρὸς ἥλιον ἀναγκάζων βλέπειν· καὶ ὁ μὲν δυνηθεὶς ὁρᾶν τοῦ ἀετοῦ υἱὸς ἐστίν, ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐκβέβληται καὶ γέγονεν ἀλιαίετος. **AbT**

It is to give a guarantee that he has added the ‘they say’, like someone who has verified everything in a very precise manner before introducing it in his poetry. **bT** Aristotle also says that the eagle places its children facing the sun and makes them look at it. The child which can sustain its view is raised, while that which cannot is removed and becomes a ‘Haliaete’. **AbT**

Here, too, the scholiast associates the use of φασί with erudite, scholarly activity, in this case the careful and precise checking of one’s facts and references (the other quality of the Aratean *Vita*’s Callimachus: ἀξιοπίστως, cf. ἀξιοπίστου, *test.*79 Pf.). Yet it is the following citation which is especially illuminating: the scholiast refers to a passage from Aristotle’s *History of Animals* to corroborate Homer’s statement on the eagle’s sharp-sightedness (*Hist.an.*9.34.620a1). Clément-Tarantino has read this under-appreciated passage as the scholiast’s appropriation of Homer’s generalised φασί ‘pour le transformer en «référence» à une observation précise d’Aristote’.<sup>32</sup> However, in doing so, she seems to suggest that the scholiast would have interpreted Homer as himself having intended this Aristotelian link. Yet any ancient scholar would surely have been aware of the chronological impossibilities of such a view and we know of other cases where scholiasts provide cross-references to later parallels

---

<sup>32</sup> Clément-Tarantino (2006a) 576.

of a specific detail, rather than earlier sources.<sup>33</sup> Rather than showing that the Alexandrians regarded Homer as a scholiast *avant la lettre*, it is better to see this scholiastic comment as a reflection of Alexandrian reading practices: when coming across a *φασί* in a text, the scholiast's first inclination was to ask 'who says?' and find an appropriate source for the fact under discussion – not necessarily Homer's original 'source', but another piece of external evidence to confirm that this is indeed what 'people say'. The evidence of the Homeric scholia, therefore, suggests that, already in antiquity, *φασί* was considered an emblem of erudite scholarship and a spur for readers to go source-hunting.<sup>34</sup> The concept of the 'Alexandrian footnote' has a considerable pedigree.

However, this lingering perception of the 'Alexandrianness' of such footnoting relies on the assumption of a dichotomy between the literary cultures of archaic and classical Greece and those of the Hellenistic world and Rome. Yet as we saw above, this is an area of considerable contestation, and any literary history (of continuity or change) should be argued for, not assumed. In the case of allusive markers, there is little evidence or argument to restrict the phenomenon *a priori* to Alexandria and Rome. To support the Hellenistic connection, Hinds notes how an 'Alexandrian footnote' mimics 'very precisely...the citation style of a learned Latin commentary.' But the example he cites (Servius on *Aen.*1.242) differs significantly from the 'Alexandrian footnote': Servius explicitly names his source (Livy), whereas poetic footnotes do not.<sup>35</sup> Despite highlighting the presence of an allusion, they do not point to the specific source – they leave the audience to fill in the gaps themselves.

Other Latinists, meanwhile, cite individual lines of Callimachus to prove the 'Alexandrian' nature of Roman footnoting, including the famous *μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἐτέρων* (*hAth.*5.56) or the fragmentary *ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν αἰίδω* (fr.612 Pf.) and *τῶς ὁ γέγειος*

---

<sup>33</sup> Harder (2013) 104.

<sup>34</sup> Scholia to other authors respond similarly: e.g. Σ Pind.*Ol.*2.51d (quoting *Od.*5.333-35, §II.3.1: 92), Σ Pind.*Pyth.*6.22 (quoting Hes.fr.283, §II.3.1: 97-99).

<sup>35</sup> Serv. *ad Aen.*1.242: *hi enim duo Troiam prodidisse dicuntur secundum Livium.*

ἔχει λόγος (fr.510 Pf.).<sup>36</sup> When they are taken out of context, however, it is uncertain whether these lines can be said to function in the same allusive manner as Hinds' 'footnotes'. And nor is it clear why scholars should not cite earlier *comparanda*. After all, the famous remark from Callimachus' fifth *Hymn* is closely modelled on a line from Euripides' *Melanippe the Wise* (οὐκ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος, ἀλλ' ἐμῆς μητρὸς πάρα, fr.484),<sup>37</sup> and we can already find similar sentiments elsewhere in fifth-century Greece, such as Pindar's φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαὶ ῥήσιες (*Ol.*7.54-5) or Euripides' παρὰ σοφῶν ἔκλυον λόγους (*Hypsipyle*, fr.752g.18). There seems little substantial justification or argument, therefore, for considering these allusive markers to be distinctively scholarly, post-classical or (just) self-consciously fictionalising.

Yet this is precisely how the phenomenon is constantly presented. Numerous scholars frame the device in terms that stress its apparent artificiality and self-consciousness: Conte's 'reflective allusion', Hinds' 'reflexive annotation', Barchiesi's self-reflexive 'tropes of intertextuality' and Tsagalis' 'meta-traditionality'.<sup>38</sup> Others, meanwhile, use the term 'Alexandrian footnote' as a catch-all title for every case of intertextual signalling, even beyond plain appeals to tradition, making the whole process an archetype of learned and scholarly behaviour.<sup>39</sup> And Wright has coined 'metamythology' as an umbrella term to define 'a type of discourse which arises when mythical characters are made to talk about themselves and their own myths, or where myths are otherwise presented, in a deliberately self-conscious manner',

---

<sup>36</sup> Fordyce (1990) 276.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Stinton (1976) 66; Ypsilanti (2009). Cf. too Eur.*Hel.*531; Pl.*Symp.*177a4.

<sup>38</sup> Conte (1986) 67; Hinds (1995); Barchiesi (2001) 129-40; Tsagalis (2011) 221-22, followed by Spelman (2018a) 93n.33.

<sup>39</sup> E.g. Reeson (2001) 40n.1: he so classes *Aeolis Aeolidae* (*Her.*11.1 ~ Eur.*Aeolus*, p.40); *Troasin* (*Her.*13.135 ~ Eur.*Troiades*, p.192). Littlewood does the same for cases of poetic memory ((2006) 26, 86); appeals to ancestors ((2011) 100), and even a metapoetically loaded use of the demonstrative *ista* ((2011) 116). Cf. too Michalopoulos (2006) 34-35.

a phenomenon which he considers specifically intellectual and destabilising, emphasising ‘the fictionality of myth’.<sup>40</sup>

In the face of such terminology, bound up with hazardous preconceptions and assumptions, I have deemed it necessary to depart from the language of my predecessors in this study and instead talk of allusive ‘indexicality’.<sup>41</sup> Amid the mass of pre-existing terminology, this is not a gratuitous neologism, but rather a means for us to focus on the essence of this phenomenon: its signalling and signposting role. Rather than just seeing such marking as the self-aware technique of a terribly clever and bookish poet, this term instead focuses on the ‘pointing’ function of allusive markers: ‘What’s the *point*?’, we are invited to ask, and ‘what are we being pointed to?’ Of course, indexicality itself is not a new term: it is commonly used in linguistics and the philosophy of language to refer to the manner in which linguistic and nonlinguistic signs point to aspects of context.<sup>42</sup> But here I am looking further back to the original associations of the Latin *index* (‘pointer, indicator’), which derives, like the verb *dico* (‘I say’), from the proto-Indo European root *\*deik-* (‘show’).<sup>43</sup> I am also indebted to the American philosopher Charles Peirce’s trichotomy of signs, in which the ‘index’ is a sensory feature that denotes and draws attention to another object: smoke, for example, can signal the presence of fire, just as an allusive marker signals the presence of allusion.<sup>44</sup> But there is also

---

<sup>40</sup> Wright (2005) 133-57 (quotation 135). Wright is keen to present this phenomenon as distinctive of Euripides’ escape-tragedies, but – as he acknowledges – it is not restricted to them: he finds examples elsewhere in Euripides (Wright (2006a) 31-40, (2006b)) and already in Homer (Wright (2006b) 38n.35).

<sup>41</sup> The best pre-existing neutral term I have found is Will’s ‘external markers’ of allusion ((1996) 30-31), but describing these markers as ‘external’ may make them sound too detached and risks undermining how integral they are to the process of poetic interpretation. My preferred terminology is already gaining some currency: Spelman (2018b) §III (‘Indices of Intertextuality’).

<sup>42</sup> Hughes – Tracy (2015). Admittedly, this is a mal-formation from the Latin: ‘indicality’ would be more accurate, but given the pre-existing currency of ‘indexicality’, I retain it here. For similar talk of allusive indexing in ancient literature in the context of catalogues: Skempis (2016) 224, (2017).

<sup>43</sup> de Vaan (2008) 169-70. Cf. Varro *L.L.*61 who already associated *dico* with the Greek δεικνύω, ‘I show’ (Keith (1992) 105-6, noting the *figura etymologica* of *dicitur index* at *Met.*2.706).

<sup>44</sup> On Peirce’s ‘index’: Atkin (2005); cf. Gell (1998)’s adoption of the term (esp. 13-14). Strictly speaking, it might be better to regard allusive markers in Peirce’s division as ‘symbols’, given their lack of a specific factual or physical

one further association of 'index' which makes it particularly fruitful for this study. In modern English, an 'index' most often refers to the catalogue at the back of a book which lists specific words or phrases alongside the page numbers where they can be located. Such literary roadmaps are an apt analogy for allusive marking: an allusive 'index' similarly points to a specific element of a larger mythical and literary whole, moving from a single passage back to the larger pathways of myth. In what follows, I shall thus be employing the language of indexicality: an 'index' (pl. 'indexes', adj. 'indexical') is a word that signposts allusion.

### **I.1.3 The Path Ahead**

In current scholarship, the 'Alexandrian footnote' and other indexes of allusion are thus frequently considered the preserve of Alexandrian and Roman poetic culture, one of the key attributes that distinguish archaic Greece from later centuries. In this study, however, I contend that such an assumption is seriously flawed, and that a close inspection of many early Greek examples reveals a similar use of these devices. From Homer onwards, indexes were employed to signpost allusion and to position a poet against their larger tradition. From the very start of the (visible) Greek tradition, indexicality was a well-established phenomenon.

Thankfully, this argument is supported by recent scholarship on early Greek poetry, which has already begun to take significant steps in this direction. A growing interest in metapoetry has led many to read archaic epic and lyric in pointedly self-conscious terms.<sup>45</sup> And in particular, a number of scholars have already suggested specific moments in these texts that can be read as knowing indexes of allusion. A selective review of examples may help set

---

connection with the objects to which they refer; the denotation is rather based on interpretation, habit and convention. But the signalling focus of Peirce's 'index' is still a useful analogy for the present study.

<sup>45</sup> Homer: Macleod (1983); Thalmann (1984) 157-84; Richardson (1990) 167-96; Goldhill (1991) 1-68; Ford (1992); Segal (1994) 85-183; de Jong (2006); Saïd (2011) 95-131. Lyric: Pavlou (2008).



the scene: stories are explicitly acknowledged as familiar to an audience, as when Circe advises Odysseus in the *Odyssey* to avoid the path of the ‘Argo **known to all**’ (Ἀργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα, *Od.*12.70), pointedly highlighting Homer’s debts to, and divergences from, the Argonautic saga,<sup>46</sup> or when Odysseus similarly designates Oedipus’ woes and crimes as ‘**known to men**’ (ἀνάπυστα...ἀνθρώποισιν, *Od.*11.274).<sup>47</sup> The transfer of specific individuals’ property appears to signal cases of intertextual role-playing: ‘in borrowing Aphrodite’s girdle’ to seduce Zeus in *Iliad* 14, Hera ‘metapoetically dons Aphrodite’s mantle’, replaying the love goddess’ seduction of Paris and Anchises (*Il.*14.188-223),<sup>48</sup> while Patroclus adopts both Achilles’ armour and *persona* in the *Iliad* (*Il.*16.130-44),<sup>49</sup> just as the hero’s son Neoptolemus symbolically succeeds his father by taking his armour in the *Little Iliad*.<sup>50</sup> Epic characters’ tears have also been read as presaging future woes which only an audience could know from the larger literary tradition,<sup>51</sup> while catalogues too appear to have been loaded sites for incorporating and contesting other traditions.<sup>52</sup> Even the whole divine framework of Greek literature seems to involve a significant indexical element: what is ‘fated’ is often shorthand for what is (or is at least claimed to be) traditional; counterfactuals explore narrative alternatives that go against tradition; major gods act as figures for the poet; and heroes are often saved because they are ‘destined’ to play a role in future episodes of the tradition.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> The *Odyssey* and Argonautic traditions: Strabo 1.2.38; Meuli (1921); Danek (1998) 252-57; West (2005b); Alden (2017) 36-37n.93. On this index: Currie (2016) 143.

<sup>47</sup> Barker – Christensen (2008) 24.

<sup>48</sup> Currie (2016) 152. Cf. Faulkner (2008) 33; Brillet-Dubois (2011) 111; Currie (2012) 556.

<sup>49</sup> Currie (2012) 556, (2016) 27n.167. Patroclus’ Achillean roleplaying: Burgess (2009) 75-83.

<sup>50</sup> Anderson (1997) 38-48.

<sup>51</sup> Currie (2016) 105-46.

<sup>52</sup> Sammons (2010). Cf. Skempis (2016) 224.

<sup>53</sup> Fate in epic: Pestalozzi (1945) 40; Nagy (1979) 40 §17n.2, 81-82 §25n.2; Schein (1984) 62-64; Janko (1992) 6, 371; Currie (2006) 7, (2016) 66; Marks (2008) 6-7; Tsagalis (2011) 226; Scodel (2017a); in tragedy: e.g. *Eur.Hel.*1676-77 (~ *Od.*4.563-69); *Eur.Or.*1656-57 (~ *Pind.Pae.*6.110-20; *Nem.*7.40-43). Counterfactuals: Morrison (1992a), (1992b). Gods as figures for the poet in epic: Marks (2008) 132-46; Loney (2014); Currie (2016) 117; in tragedy, Easterling (1993). Divine rescue: Marks (2010).

In addition, other specific indexes have been identified in these early texts, including cases of echo and family relations. For the former, we could cite the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*, which pointedly ‘echoes’ a famous nightingale simile from the *Odyssey* (*Hh*.19.16-18 ~ *Od*.19.518-21);<sup>54</sup> the ‘echoing cicada’ of the Hesiodic *Aspis*, which recalls its earlier appearance in Hesiod’s *Works and Days* (*Scut*.393 ~ *Op*.582);<sup>55</sup> and the presence of ‘Echo’ in Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazusae*, which self-consciously tropes the dramatist’s extensive rewriting of Euripides’ *Andromeda* (*Thesm*.10569-97).<sup>56</sup> As for family relations, we may note the intertextual relationship between specific *Homeric Hymns* (the sibling rivalry of Hermes and Apollo in *HhHerm*; the father-son relation of Pan and Hermes in *Hh*.19);<sup>57</sup> Aristophanes’ figuring of Philocles’ *Pandionis* tetralogy as a derivative ‘descendant’ of Sophocles’ *Tereus* (*Ar*.*Av*.281-83);<sup>58</sup> and Theognis’ substitution of the Hesiodic Αἰδώς with her daughter Σωφροσύνη, marking his own debts to his Hesiodic ‘parent text’ (*Thgn*.1135-50 ~ *Op*.200).<sup>59</sup> In Attic tragedy more generally, Isabelle Torrance has also argued for a wide range of ‘metapoetically loaded terms’ which are ‘used as triggers for audience recognition of novelties or continuations in relation to earlier sources’: δεύτερος, δισσός, καίνος, and μῦθος.<sup>60</sup>

These recent approaches give an idea of how fruitful a fuller exploration of allusive marking in early Greek poetry may prove to be. Yet despite these first steps, no previous scholar has offered a comprehensive study of allusive marking in any period, let alone early Greek poetry. Individual examples are normally adduced in support of a specific argument for a specific allusion, which leaves the larger picture remarkably hazy. As far as I am aware, the scholar who has come closest to offering a fuller catalogue is Bruno Currie, who concludes his

---

<sup>54</sup> Thomas (2011) 169; Germany (2005) 199-203.

<sup>55</sup> Bing (2012) 186-87.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Austin – Olson (2004) 321-26; Phillips (2015).

<sup>57</sup> Thomas (2011) 168, (2017) 78-81.

<sup>58</sup> Sommerstein (1987) 215; Wright (2016) 99-100.

<sup>59</sup> Hunter (2014) 138-39.

<sup>60</sup> Torrance (2013) 183. On the marking of novelty in tragedy, cf. McDermott (1987), (1991); Cole (2008); Torrance (2013) 222-27.

discussion of ‘pregnant tears’ with a list of some allusive markers in Homer and Attic tragedy, many of which I will discuss at greater length in this study. However, in simply providing a select catalogue of potential examples, without detailed examination, and with no mention of Pindar or other lyricists, these few pages do little more than cover some of the groundwork for this present work.<sup>61</sup> In analysing these and further examples in detail, I intend to provide a more holistic and analytical study of these allusive markers, exploring their purpose and function, as well as their development across time.

In this study, I have chosen to focus on the development of three specific indexes of allusion in archaic epic and lyric poetry (including iambus, elegy and *melos*), from Homer to Pindar.<sup>62</sup> The three I have selected represent the indexes most commonly identified in literature of later times: [1] appeals to tradition and report (the ‘Alexandrian footnote’ proper); [2] the allusive force of characters’, narrators’ and audiences’ memories (and knowledge); and [3] the manipulation of temporality to evoke both former and future literary events. All three, I contend, were deeply embedded in our earliest archaic Greek poetry, and in each chapter I shall explore their comparable and complementary usage. Due to limitations of space, I cannot cover every example, but the impression I have gained is that a very high percentage of examples of the language of hearsay, memory and time are indexical – a far higher percentage than one might initially suspect. Rather than offer a dry catalogue, I shall focus on a selection that illuminate the range of ways in which each index was used in archaic epic and lyric. We shall see that all three of these indexes were an integral part of the literary tradition from the very start, a conclusion which compels us to radically reconfigure modern narratives of ancient literary history and our perception of archaic Greek poetics.

---

<sup>61</sup> Currie (2016) 26-27, 139-44. Spelman (2018a) now offers a few hints for Pindar and lyric (General Index, s.v. ‘*dicitur* motif’, ‘metatraditionality’).

<sup>62</sup> I use ‘lyric’ throughout in its broad sense: Campbell (1982) xiv-xxix; Budelmann (2009) 2-7. I recognise the anachronism of this usage and that it risks blurring the significant differences between these different genres, but it remains a convenient catch-all category, especially to oppose this material to ‘epic’.

Before we turn to each index in turn, however, I must first outline my methodological approach to allusion in archaic Greek poetry as a framework for this study. This is a controversial topic, and one that raises some different (and difficult) questions to those which face scholars of Hellenistic and Roman texts. It is thus worth spending some time addressing the issues involved.

## I.2 Frameworks for Intertextuality in Early Greek Poetry

The earliest extant Greek texts were not composed in a vacuum. Already in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, we find a keen awareness of numerous mythological traditions that lie beyond the scope of their immediate narratives. The exploits of other heroes, the wider Trojan war tradition and the events of other mythical sagas repeatedly punctuate both Homeric poems, as the narrator and his characters recall past and future events, often very obliquely.<sup>63</sup> Lyric poets, too, frequently mention and narrate a whole host of myths, many of which – we know – had already been treated by their peers and epic forebears. As far back as our evidence lets us see, Greek poets were deeply immersed in a larger tradition of poetry and myth.

How we account for, describe and analyse early Greek poetry's engagement with this tradition, however, is a matter of considerable debate, centred around a number of key theoretical questions: How 'oral' was archaic Greek epic and lyric poetry, and what do we even mean by this word? To what extent could 'oral' works refer (or be understood to refer) to other specific 'texts' (be they 'oral' or 'written'), as opposed to the larger trappings of the poetic tradition: *topoi*, formulae and generic features? How and when did poems become fixed enough (in memory or in writing) to be recognisable entities in their own right, rather than just evanescent instantiations of tradition? To what extent can we chart a development from a primarily 'oral' to an increasingly 'literate' poetic culture between the eighth and fifth centuries BCE? And finally, how should we deal with the fact that we have such limited access to the whole range of poetic texts and traditions that once populated the literary map of archaic and classical Greece?

These are complex questions, with no easy answers. Yet how we address them is of crucial importance for any study of early Greek intertextuality, especially when dealing with

---

<sup>63</sup> The bibliography is vast. E.g. *Iliad*: Kullmann (1960); Alden (2000); Radif (2002); Grethlein (2006a) 334-40. *Odyssey*: Danek (1998); Alden (2017). The developed formulaic systems on display in many passing references imply well-established traditions: Schein (2002) 88.

the earliest and most controversial case of all: Homeric epic.<sup>64</sup> The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are products of a long-established oral tradition, comparable to those found in many other parts of the world, but we encounter them today in a fixed, written form. How we reconcile these two facts is a constant scholarly dilemma. To make matters worse, we do not even know when or how these texts became fixed in a form similar to that in which we read them today: were they dictated by an oral bard, gradually crystallised through centuries of (re-)performance, or carefully crafted by an oral poet who was able to take full advantage of the nascent technology of writing?<sup>65</sup> Despite these uncertainties, two major approaches have emerged in modern scholarship that offer alternative frameworks for understanding Homer's engagement with the wider poetic tradition: 'traditional referentiality' and 'neoanalysis'. Since I will exploit elements of both in this study, it is worth touching on each before I go on to outline my own approach to early Greek allusion.

The first, 'traditional referentiality', foregrounds the oral background of the Homeric poems and the larger 'resonance' embedded in their structural elements.<sup>66</sup> Scholars who favour

---

<sup>64</sup> The clearest discussions of these issues are Burgess (2009) 56-71, a revised version of Burgess (2006), and Currie (2016) 1-38, 259-62. Other helpful discussions of intertextuality in archaic epic include Janko (1982) 225-28; Edwards (1985a) 5-9; Pucci (1987) 26-30; Cairns (2001a) 35-48; R.B. Rutherford (2001) 125-26; Currie (2006); Tsagalis (2011), (2014) 240-44; Bakker (2013) 157-69, with the review of Kelly (2015b) 679-81; Ormand (2014) 11-15; Edmunds (2016).

<sup>65</sup> Useful overviews: Ford (1997); Foley (2011) 848-50; Saïd (2011) 39-44. The major theories, none without problems, are: (1) Dictation (variously from the 8<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> centuries): Lord (1953); Janko (1992) 37-38, (1998); Reece (2005); Teodorsson (2006); Foley (2011); Jensen (2011); Ready (2015). (2) Gradual crystallisation through performance, resulting in performance multiforms: Nagy (1996a) 107-52, (1996b) 29-112, (2014); González (2013) 15-175. (3) A poet who exploits the new technology of writing to develop a text of extraordinary length: Parry (1966); Lohmann (1970) 211-12, (1988) 76-77; Lloyd-Jones (1981); Garvie (1994) 16 with n.51; Reichel (1998); Fowler (2004) 230-31; Rösler (2011); West (2011a) 10-14; Rutherford (2013) 32 with n.104; Kullmann (2015) 105. Certainty is impossible, but I am inclined to suppose an early recording of both Homeric poems either by dictation or a writing poet; I conceive of each as a poetically designed unity; and I use 'Homer' to refer to the constructed author of each poem. For criticism of Nagy's evolutionary model: Currie (2016) 15-16.

<sup>66</sup> Foley (1991), (1999), (2002); Graziosi – Haubold (2005) 48-56; Kelly (2007a); Barker – Christensen (2008); Foley – Arft (2015).

this approach interpret individual formulae, type scenes and story patterns against all their other appearances in the tradition, unearthing a further connotative or immanent meaning which would have been familiar to attuned ancient audiences. In every instance, this immanent meaning raises expectations in an audience that can be fulfilled or thwarted, and departures from the norm are poetically meaningful: when Aeneas lifts a stone to throw at Achilles in *Iliad* 20.285-86, for example, he performs an act that usually leads to a decisive victory. For a brief and transitory moment, Homer raises the possibility that the Trojan might defeat the Greek hero.<sup>67</sup> Even a single word can bear such an associative resonance: μῆνις, the opening word of the *Iliad*, is traditionally restricted to gods in early Greek epic, except for four Iliadic occasions on which it refers to Achilles. For an audience familiar with this traditional usage, the poem's very first word marks the hero's superhuman status and special connection with the divine.<sup>68</sup> On a larger scale, too, words and motifs can be packed with a specifically generic resonance, evoking the traditional trappings of one particular genre (such as choral lyric, epigram, hymn, iambus, lament), which can then be manipulated and redeployed in other contexts.<sup>69</sup> By focusing on the rich pool of tradition, this 'algorithm of *pars pro toto*' thus downplays the possibility of specific referentiality in early Greek poetry, instead favouring typological 'recurrence' over pointed 'repetition'.<sup>70</sup> In its most extreme form, it can even deny the possibility of direct and specific allusion outright, although this – as we shall see – is a step too far.<sup>71</sup> Nevertheless, traditional referentiality is an extremely useful framework, which rescues the formula from accusations of dry banality and highlights the rich associative depths of the epic language.

---

<sup>67</sup> Kelly (2007a) 4, 294-95; cf. Anderson (1997) 70n.17.

<sup>68</sup> Sacks (1987) 3-4.

<sup>69</sup> Homer and...choral lyric: Richardson (2011); Steiner (2017). Epigram: Elmer (2005). Hymn: Hunter (2012) 91-97. Iambus: Steinrück (2008); Lavigne (2017). Lament: Tsagalis (2004). Wedding song: Karanika (2013).

<sup>70</sup> Foley – Arft (2015) 82-85.

<sup>71</sup> E.g. Nagy (1979) 42: 'when we are dealing with the traditional poetry of the Homeric (and Hesiodic) compositions, it is not justifiable to claim that a passage in any text can refer to another passage in another text.'

The second dominant approach of contemporary Homeric criticism, ‘neoanalysis’, foregrounds the textuality of the Homeric poems and postulates other fixed ‘texts’ as specific sources for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.<sup>72</sup> Scholars of this approach reconstruct these lost texts on the basis of internal evidence within each poem, as well as later external sources, such as the Homeric scholia, prose mythographers and surviving information about the Epic Cycle. In the past, these putative ‘texts’ were considered to be written works,<sup>73</sup> but more recent neoanalysts have revised this view to embrace the idea of the poet interacting with ‘fixed’ oral texts.<sup>74</sup> A common argumentative strategy is that of ‘motif transference’: neoanalysts identify a motif known from later sources whose employment appears better suited and contextualised than its application in Homer, concluding that the Homeric instance is secondary, while the other account is primary and reflects a pre-Homeric source. For example, when Thetis laments over Achilles after Patroclus’ death in *Iliad* 18 (*Il.*18.1-147), many scholars discern a proleptic foreshadowing of Achilles’ own death, an episode familiar to us from the Cyclic *Aethiopis* (*Aeth.*arg.4a) and other later sources (*Od.*24.47-64; *Pind.**Isth.*8.57-8; *Quint.**Smyrn.*3.525-787), but which they suppose was already established in pre-Homeric poetry; Homer’s evocation of this scene reinforces the impression of Achilles’ impending demise.<sup>75</sup> Through such arguments as these, neoanalysts enrich our appreciation of Homeric poetry and the creative and allusive uses that Homer made of his poetic tradition.

These two approaches are often opposed by scholars,<sup>76</sup> but they are far from incompatible in practice: typical motifs and transferred motifs are not mutually exclusive. Scholars of both camps readily acknowledge this compatibility, even if they largely refrain

---

<sup>72</sup> Useful surveys: Clark (1986); Willcock (1997); Davies (2016) 3-24; Gainsford (2016) 104-9.

<sup>73</sup> An extreme case is Schadewaldt’s reconstruction of a hypothetical pre-Homeric *\*Memnonis* written in four books of twenty scenes ((1965) 155-202), a reconstruction treated as fact by Kullmann (1984) 316.

<sup>74</sup> Edwards (1985b) 219-20; Torres-Guerra (1995) 13-14; Dowden (1996) 47-48; Currie (2016) 12-22.

<sup>75</sup> Pestalozzi (1945) 26, 32, 42; Kakridis (1949) 65-75; Burgess (2009) 83-85; Currie (2016) 119-26.

<sup>76</sup> E.g. differing interpretations of Διὸς βουλή (*Il.*1.5): Kullmann (1955), (1956a); Allan (2008a); Currie (2016) 1-3; Edmunds (2016). The debate is especially visible between two Oxford scholars, Kelly and Currie: e.g. on *Il.*8.78-93 (Kelly (2006); Currie (2016) 247-53); *Il.*18.1-147 (Kelly (2012); Currie (2016) 255-58).



from pursuing it themselves.<sup>77</sup> In many ways, the theoretical debates that arise between these two ‘schools’ are akin to those found in later Latin literature, as to whether one should prioritise allusion to specific texts or evocation of generic *topoi*.<sup>78</sup> And as in Roman poetry, so too here, we can gain a fuller picture of Homer’s ‘allusive art’ by focusing on his evocation of both the typological and the specific. In this study, I thus strive to follow a middle path between these two approaches, taking account of archaic poetry’s oral, typological background as well as its potential for more specific, pointed reference. In this, I am indebted above all to Jonathan Burgess’ framework of ‘oral, intertextual neoanalysis’, a sophisticated remodelling of neoanalysis within an oralist frame.<sup>79</sup> When dealing with the lost pre-Homeric poetic context, Burgess detects allusion not to specific pre-Homeric poems, but rather to pre-existing mythological traditions, the core elements of a story that would be familiar from every telling.<sup>80</sup> This is a small, but significant difference. Not only does it avoid the implausibility of reconstructing specific fluid-yet-fixed oral poems,<sup>81</sup> but it also fits with the Homeric poems’ own presentation of the fluidity of epic song as a series of interconnected paths (οἴματα), from

---

<sup>77</sup> Kelly (2007a) 12, (2018a); Currie (2016) 8. Kullmann (1984) offers an early and limited attempt at reconciliation.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Currie (2016) 9, citing Hinds (1998) 34-47.

<sup>79</sup> Burgess (2006), (2009); cf. Reece (2011)’s ‘neoanalytic approach with an oral twist’; Danek (2016)’s ‘oral traditional intertextuality’. Nagy’s concept of ‘cross-referencing’ between ‘traditions of composition-in-performance’ (e.g. (2003) 7-19; (2015)) is vaguely comparable, but lacks the theoretical sophistication of Burgess’ approach.

<sup>80</sup> See already Willcock (1983) 485n.8 (‘mythological material’). Comparable are discussions of ‘song traditions’ rather than specific ‘poems’: Nagy (1990a) 79; Tsagalis (2008) 67-68.

<sup>81</sup> Currie’s example of this phenomenon is unconvincing: he cites the first 9 lines of the fourth and eighteenth *Homeric Hymns* (both to Hermes) as independent instantiations of the very same poem (Currie (2006) 2, (2016) 14). But it is not really fair to describe them as such, given the huge disparity in their lengths (580 and 12 lines respectively), and the complete lack of a narrative in the shorter poem. Nor do we have any reason to suppose that the verbal similarity is the result of oral recomposition, rather than later written excerption (cf. West (2003a) 4-5, 18). Even more implausible is the idea of poets recycling ‘stable’ and static poems that have been memorised word-for-word (e.g. Montanari (2012) 6), an approach which is difficult to reconcile with comparative evidence of other oral traditions, where even ‘memorised’ or ‘reperformed’ songs are not repeated *verbatim* (Finnegan (1977) 76-77; cf. Martin (2013)).

which one can start at any point (ἀμόθεν, *Od.*1.10).<sup>82</sup> The internal songs of the *Odyssey*, after all, are defined not as discrete poems but rather in terms of their mythological content: the return of the Achaeans (Ἀχαιῶν νόστον, *Od.*1.326), the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles (νεῖκος Ὀδυσσῆος καὶ Πηλεΐδew Ἀχιλλῆος, *Od.*8.75), the construction of the wooden horse (ἵππου κόσμον... δουρατέου, *Od.*8.492-93). Given that we lack any access to the host of earlier pre-Homeric stories, it is methodologically far more responsible to follow Burgess in talking of Homer's engagement with such mythological traditions, rather than putative, isolated and specific poems.<sup>83</sup> I shall outline and exemplify this approach below (§I.2.1), before addressing the further issues of our limited evidence (§I.2.2) and the transition from such 'mythological' to full 'textual' intertextuality (§II.2.3).

### I.2.1 Mythological Intertextuality

Crucial to Burgess' case for an 'oral, intertextual neoanalysis' is the recognition that there are limits to the formulaic nature of early Greek poetry. As he remarks, 'typology does not overwhelm the distinctiveness of individual characters and their stories;' otherwise, 'a myth-teller would be free to gather together a new collocation of motifs every time the story is told. Achilles could wear a lion skin and brandish a club, Odysseus could command the Argo, and Agamemnon could put out his eyes after marrying his mother.'<sup>84</sup> Such a humorous counterfactual highlights the limits of typology, limits which were already recognised in

---

<sup>82</sup> Ford (1992) 40-48, 67-72.

<sup>83</sup> Even hardcore Neoanalysts occasionally slip into this mode of discourse: Currie (2012) 574-75n.163 claims that a 'Prometheus narrative [not 'poem!'] of some textual fixity seems to lie behind Hes. *Th.* and *WD.*' His earlier claim that 'it does not matter that there is no single definitive narration within the Dumuzi-Inana corpus' ((2012) 559n.90) might also make us question the need to reconstruct individual Greek epics.

<sup>84</sup> Burgess (2006) 155-58 (quotation p.156); cf. Scodel (2002) 24: 'The most famous events associated with a hero...create a core heroic personality', which 'bards could reduplicate...in different situations.'

antiquity: Aristotle remarks in the *Poetics* that one cannot break up ‘transmitted stories’ (παρειλημμένους μύθους), such as Clytemnestra’s death at Orestes’ hands or Eriphyle’s at Alcmaeon’s (Aristot.*Poet.*14.1453b.22-6). Individual myths and stories clearly contained their own steady core of specific elements which did not depend on any particular instantiation. It is to specific motifs of this ‘stable skeleton of narrative’,<sup>85</sup> Burgess contends, that other songs and performances could allude, even within the traditional and typological context of early Greek epic. For archaic epic, some of these mythological traditions would have doubtless been epic in form; indeed, as Tsagalis notes, the shared performance context ‘would have channelled mythical allusion towards other epic songs performed *under similar conditions*.’<sup>86</sup> Yet they would have also embraced other media, including non-epic storytelling, other kinds of poetry and artistic representations.<sup>87</sup> The plausibility of this model is reinforced by comparative oral traditions in which we can identify similar allusions to other stories.<sup>88</sup>

Of course, mythological traditions themselves were never static and unchanging, and some have questioned whether any definitive and stable version of past myths ever existed.<sup>89</sup> If multiple conflicting versions were in circulation, even within the very same poem, and if poets were free to add innovative elements to mythical *paradeigmata* to fit their immediate contexts,<sup>90</sup> how can we determine to which version of a myth poets might be alluding in any given case, or even which of many potential versions their original audiences might have been familiar with or considered ‘canonical’? This is a pressing concern, and one which is too often glossed over by neoanalysts. Yet one must equally be wary of exaggerating the significance of

---

<sup>85</sup> Lord (1960) 99.

<sup>86</sup> Tsagalis (2011) 232 (original emphasis).

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Gainsford (2016) 57-63. See e.g. Ready (2014) on Homeric allusion to folktale.

<sup>88</sup> Allusion in Serbian Christian epics: Danek (2002) 13-15, (2010) 230-233, (2016); Currie (2016) 5-6.

<sup>89</sup> E.g. Andersen (1990), who contends that ‘even basic mythological facts are represented differently by different characters according to context’ in the *Iliad* (p.40) and argues from this that ‘there never was a “standard” version that the poet could rely on and the audience keep in mind. Inside as well as outside of the *Iliad*, “facts” seem to have been rather fluctuating’ (p.41). Cf. Andersen (1998). For such fluidity in vase depictions: Lowenstam (1992) 189-91.

<sup>90</sup> On Homeric innovation: Willcock (1964), (1977); Braswell (1971). Contrast Dué (2002) 83-89.

such discrepancies in the archaic mythological record. Where differences occur, they tend to be minor and superficial for the overall narrative trajectory and it is often only the instigator of an action which changes, not the action itself: Thetis is still given to Peleus, whether by the gods (*Il.*18.84-85), Zeus (*Il.*18.432) or Hera (*Il.*24.60); Coroebus, a suitor of Cassandra, is still killed, whether by Neoptolemus (in the ‘majority version’, ὁ πλείων λόγος) or Diomedes (according to the poet ‘Lescheos’, Λέσχεως: Paus.10.27.1 = *Il. Parv.*fr.24); Polyxena still dies, whether through wounds inflicted by Odysseus and Diomedes in the sack of Troy (*Cypria* fr.34 PEG) or as a sacrifice on Achilles’ tomb (*Il. Pers.*arg.4c); and Astyanax is still thrown from the city walls, whether by Neoptolemus (*Il. Parv.*fr.29) or Odysseus (*Il. Pers.*arg.4a).<sup>91</sup> In all four of these cases (Thetis’ marriage, and the deaths of Coroebus, Polyxena and Astyanax), we have a fixed, unalterable event of the Trojan war narrative, even if its precise details varied. As Burgess has remarked, ‘[w]hile it would be mistaken to insist that the details of any one manifestation of a myth were always present in every telling of that myth, it is also clear that Greek myth was remarkably stable in the presentation of the sequences of major actions that constituted any given story.’<sup>92</sup> The same view was also apparently dominant in antiquity. When Sophocles has Agamemnon die in the bath (*El.*445) rather than at the table as in Homer (*Od.*4.535), the scholia dismiss the inconsistency (Σ *S.El.*446):

ἥρκει γὰρ τὰ ὅλα συμφωνεῖν τῷ πράγματι· τὰ γὰρ κατὰ μέρος ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἕκαστος ὥς βούλεται πραγματεύεσθαι, εἰ μὴ τὸ πᾶν βλάβη τῆς ὑποθέσεως.

For it is enough if the general lines of the stories agree. As for the details, each <poet> has the licence to treat them as he likes, provided he does not do damage to the story at large. (tr. Nünlist (2009) 179)

<sup>91</sup> On the myth and its reception: Kern (1918); Phillippo (2007). Some later accounts have Scamandrius (= Astyanax?) survive and found a new Troy or other settlements, sometimes alongside Aeneas’ son Ascanius, but this version may simply reflect later epichoric foundation narratives (Andersen (1998) 139n.6; Erskine (2001) 102), or echo an earlier tradition in which Hector had two separate sons, Astyanax (who was killed) and Scamandrius (who survived): Smith (1981) 53-58; cf. Anaxikrates *FGrH* 307 F1. In that case, *Il.*6.402-3 would acknowledge and smooth over Homer’s assimilation of the pair.

<sup>92</sup> Burgess (2009) 5; cf. Ford (1992) 40.

Whether Agamemnon was killed in the bath or at a feast, it ultimately does not matter: he died either way, and that is the fixed element of the myth.<sup>93</sup> It is thus possible, with appropriate care and caution, to reconstruct the core details of a mythological narrative, what Kullmann would call a *Faktenkanon* or Burgess a *fabula*, a constellation of fixed narrative events with which the Homeric and other later poems could allusively engage.<sup>94</sup>

Given the typological oral environment of early Greek epic, we should largely expect allusions to such *fabulae* to be based around repeated key themes and motifs, rather than extensive verbal repetition. The foremost example of such motif-based allusion is the *Iliad*'s evocation of the 'death of Achilles' *fabula*, which lies at the heart of the second half of the poem and has been extensively studied by numerous scholars: the allusion is not based primarily on verbal correspondence, but rather on large-scale motif transference, as a whole series of episodes from the *fabula* of Achilles' death are redeployed in another context.<sup>95</sup> On a larger scale, moreover, the whole myth of the Trojan war appears to be constructed around an extensive chain of such interlocking *fabulae*: the sack of Andromache's Thebe foreshadows and parallels that of Troy; the Trojan horse eerily mirrors the ships with which Paris first sailed to Sparta, cut from the same Idaean wood (cf. Tryph.59-61); and most elaborately, Neoptolemus' career closely follows that of his father Achilles: the hero pointedly receives his father's arms from Achilles as a sign of succession (*Il.Parv.arg.3a*), spear and all, unlike Patroclus' flawed attempt at Achilles-imitation (*Il.Parv.fr.5*; *Il.16.140-4*); his first victim, Eurypylus (*Od.11.519-20*,

---

<sup>93</sup> On questions of poetic licence: Nünlist (2009) 174-84. For an alternative view: Σ *Ol.4.31b*; Σ *Isth.1.15b*; Eratosthenes (fr.I.A.19). But as Nünlist remarks (p.180), Strabo's polemic against Eratosthenes (1.2.3) is 'more representative of the ancient outlook.'

<sup>94</sup> *Faktenkanon*: Kullmann (1960) 12-13; Dowden (1996) 51-52. *Fabula*: Burgess (2006) 160 with n.30, (2009) 27 with n.1, (2017). Cf. Marks (2008) 6: 'certain broad "facts"'; Lamari (2010) 135-6: 'mythical megatext'. Even those sceptical of the extent of allusion in Homeric poetry accept that 'there were elements in the tradition which could not be tampered with, and that would constitute a frame of reference for poet and audience alike.' (Andersen (1998) 141).

<sup>95</sup> Burgess (2009) 72-97.

*Il.Parv.arg.3c-d*), parallels both Achilles' first, Telephus (Eurypylus' father) and last, Memnon (cf. *Od.11.522*); and his savage refusal of Astynous' supplication (*Il.Parv.fr.21*) mirrors Achilles' treatment of Lycaon (*Il.21.34-135*). All these parallels, however, only serve to underlie the ultimate difference in the two heroes' treatment of Priam, Achilles' sympathy in *Iliad* 24 serving as a foil for Neoptolemus' unquenchable bloodthirst (*Il.Pers.arg.2c*; *Il.Parv.fr.25*).<sup>96</sup>

As another example of how to conceive of such *fabula*-based allusion, we could cite the famous 'Nestor's cup' inscription, our earliest known case of Greek intertextuality. A Rhodian *kotyle*, discovered in a late eighth century Ischian cremation burial, bears the following inscription in Euboean script (*CEG I 454 = SEG 26.1114*):

Νέστοροός : ἐ[ἔν τ]ι :<sup>97</sup> εὖποτ[ον] : ποτέριον.  
 ἡὸς δ' ἄν τῷδε πίῃσι : ποτερί[ῳ] : αὐτίκα κῆνον  
 ἡμέροσ χαιρέσει : καλλιστε[φά]νῳ Ἀφροδίτῃς.

Nestor had a drinking cup that was good to drink from; but the desire of fair-crowned Aphrodite will immediately seize whoever drinks from *this* drinking cup.

These verses, comprised of a likely iambic trimeter and two dactylic hexameters,<sup>98</sup> set up a humorous and pointed opposition between archaic epic and the world of the symposium.<sup>99</sup>

<sup>96</sup> Anderson (1990) 20-26 on the horse/ships; 38-48 on Neoptolemus/Achilles; 56-57 on Thebe/Troy.

<sup>97</sup> I follow Wachter (2010) 253n.18 in printing Heubeck's imperfect ἐ[ἔν τ]ι instead of ἐ[ἰμ]ι. The simple predicative use of the possessive genitive is unobjectionable (Smyth (1956) 315 §1303; contrast Watkins (1976) 37n.19) and lays greater stress on the possessor (Smyth (1956) 342 §1480), which – alongside the noun's emphatic verse-initial position – reinforces the allusion. On this crux: Rüter – Matthiessen (1968) 245; Hansen (1976) 29-33; Watkins (1976) 37-39; Risch (1987) 1-6; Faraone (1996) 78n.3; Pavese (1996) 8; Gerhard (2011).

<sup>98</sup> I follow most commentators in regarding the first line as an iambic trimeter (with ἐ[ἰμ]ι, it would be a choriamb and two iambic metra) (e.g. Watkins (1976) 33-37; West (1982) 40n.27; Pavese (1996) 9-10) rather than plain prose (contrast Hansen (1976) 35-40; Powell (1991) 165n.116).

<sup>99</sup> For the cup's sympotic affinities: Latacz (1990) 233-35; Powell (1991) 165; Murray (1994). Other interpretations are in no way incompatible with this allusive reading (cf. Lamboley (2001) 36): the cup as the possession of a historical Pithecusan named Nestor (Dihle (1969) 258-59; Durante (1971) 143n.14; Gallavotti (1976) 216; Fehling (1991) 41; Pavese (1996) 10-13); as a magical aphrodisiac spell (Faraone (1996); Dihle (1969) 261).

The humble clay *kotyle* that bears the inscription is contrasted with the epic Nestor's large and elaborately-wrought drinking vessel familiar to us from the *Iliad* (*Il.*11.632-37). Many scholars have suspected a precise allusion to this Iliadic scene in the inscription, taking it as evidence that our version of the *Iliad* was already well-known in the Greek world of Euboea and its colonies in the late eighth century.<sup>100</sup> Given our lack of further evidence for eighth century literary culture, such a direct literary relationship cannot be ruled out, but it should be stressed that the cup's allusion is not based on any verbal correspondences with our Iliadic passage, and its diction departs significantly from Homeric usage.<sup>101</sup> In reality, the parallel depends only on similarities of theme and topic: the knowledge required for the allusion to work is simply that Nestor possessed a large and ornate cup, awareness of which could derive from many other sources besides our *Iliad*.<sup>102</sup>

Indeed, scholars have not refrained from proposing other potential epic 'sources' for the cup's allusion: Stephanie West suggests epic poetry on the exploits of Nestor's youth,<sup>103</sup> while Danek proposes the scene from the *Cypria* in which Nestor hosted Menelaus (*Cypr.*arg.4b) and apparently encouraged him to drink wine to scatter his 'cares' (*Cypr.*fr.18).<sup>104</sup> It would be misleading, however, to pinpoint any of these as the specific 'source' of the cup's allusion, given that Nestor appears to have been associated with lavish hospitality, plentiful drinking and a large, ornate cup in many texts and traditions. Drinking vessels, like many other material objects, were highly prized in the world of Greek epic as a source of prestige and authority,<sup>105</sup> and elaborate descriptions of them were a traditional feature of not just Greek,

<sup>100</sup> E.g. Rüter – Matthiessen (1968) 249-54; Snodgrass (1971) 431; Heubeck (1979) 114; Kirk (1985) 4; Powell (1991) 163-67, 208-9; Murray (1994) 51; Graham (1995) 6-7; Latacz (1996) 61-63; Malkin (1998) 156-60; Fantuzzi – Hunter (2004) 286-87; Bing (2009) 151-55.

<sup>101</sup> West (1994) 14; Peters (1998); González (2013) 129-41. Contrast Cassio (1994).

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Buchner – Russo (1955) 233-34; Schadewaldt (1965) 413-16; Burkert (1976) 19-20; Watkins (1976) 37-38; Taplin (1992) 33n.39; West (1995) 205; Osborne (1996) 109; Lowenstam (1997) 48-49; Snodgrass (1998) 52-53; Burgess (2001a) 114; Wachter (2006) col.84.

<sup>103</sup> West (1994) 14.

<sup>104</sup> Danek (1994/95); cf. Kullmann (1960) 257n.2; Hansen (1976) 43; Fantuzzi – Hunter (2004) 287.

<sup>105</sup> Cook (2000), citing *Il.*11.774, 16.220-32, 24.234; *Od.*4.614-9. Cf. Lowenstam (1997) 48-49.

but also Near Eastern poetic traditions.<sup>106</sup> Yet Nestor's association with drinking-ware transcends such typological norms. In addition to the *Iliad* and *Cypria*, we could cite *Odyssey* 3, where Pylos is first presented as a place of feasting and merriment (*Od.* 3.5-9, 32-66). Nestor's son Peisistratus there presents Telemachus and Athena-Mentor with a beautiful golden cup for prayer (χρυσείῳ δέπαϊ, *Od.* 3.41; χρύσειον ἄλεισον, 3.50, 53; καλὸν δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον, 3.63), a cup which Bing has suggested could be the very same as in the *Iliad*, given that the goblet there is said to have been brought from home (ὁ οἶκοθεν ἦγ' ὁ γεραῖός, *Il.* 11.632).<sup>107</sup> Athenaeus' later mention of a 'cup of Nestor' dedicated to Artemis in Capua, not far from Ischia, might also suggest a local tradition surrounding the heroic Nestor's cup which could have already been circulating in the region in archaic times.<sup>108</sup> Nestor was thus closely associated with a large, ornate cup throughout early Greek epic, symbolising his panache for hospitality and storytelling. Rather than detecting a precise engagement with the *Iliad* or any other specific text in the Pithecusan inscription, it is better to see an allusion to an established feature of the *fabula* of the hero's life.<sup>109</sup> The inscription evokes not just the Nestor of the *Iliad*, but rather the Nestor of tradition at large, known for his many instances of hospitality and feasting. In so doing, it situates its humbler self within the literary tradition, setting its brief epigrammatic form against the grandeur of the epic tradition.<sup>110</sup> This allusion can thus be taken as an archetype of what we might usually expect in archaic Greek epic itself: an engagement with the themes, motifs and narrative events of other mythological traditions (*fabulae*), rather than precise verbal echoes of another specific poem.

---

<sup>106</sup> West (1995) 205 with n.13.

<sup>107</sup> Bing (2009) 152; cf. Ridgway (1992) 56; Malkin (1998) 157. Notably, both cups are golden or decorated with gold (χρυσείοις ἥλοισι, *Il.* 11.633; πελειάδες... χρύσειαι, *Il.* 11.634-635 ~ χρυσείῳ δέπαϊ, *Od.* 3.41; χρύσειον ἄλεισον, *Od.* 3.50, 53) and beautiful (δέπας περικαλλές, *Il.* 11.632 ~ καλὸν δέπας, *Od.* 3.63), although they are not completely identical: the Iliadic cup has four handles (οὐατα... τέσσαρ' *Il.* 11.633-4), whereas the Odyssean cup only has two (ἀμφικύπελλον, *Od.* 3.63).

<sup>108</sup> *Athen.* 11.466e, 489b-c; Faraone (1996) 106-7; Lamboley (2001) 34-36.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. von Möllendorff (2011) 425; Swift (2012) 141-42.

<sup>110</sup> Reinforced by 'un jeu métrique': Gerhard (2011) 9. Cf. Dell'Oro (2013) for other early inscriptions' tendency to situate themselves in and against the literary tradition.



Nevertheless, although the majority of archaic ‘mythological’ allusions would function in this manner, an oral poetic environment does not entirely preclude the possibility of verbal allusion and ‘quotation’, even when we are talking of mythological traditions, not fixed poems. As Burgess has again demonstrated, certain phraseology could become associated with specific *fabulae*, narrative contexts or characters and then allusively redeployed in other settings. As Homeric examples, he offers the phrase μέγας μεγαλωστί, which appears to be connected with the *fabula* of Achilles’ death (*Od.*24.40, *Il.*18.26), and the language associated with Astyanax’s fate which is pointedly and proleptically evoked in the *Iliad* (*Il.**Parv.*fr.29.3-5; *Il.*6.467-70, 24.735).<sup>111</sup> As a further example, we could cite the Iliadic description of the hundred-hander Briareus as ‘greater in strength than his father’ (ὁ γὰρ αὖτε βίη οὗ πατρὸς ἀμείνων, *Il.*1.404), a phrase which seems to allude to the *fabula* of Achilles’ birth and the prophesied supremacy of Thetis’ offspring.<sup>112</sup> These are not cases of one text quoting another, but rather instances in which the use of certain phrases and language may evoke specific episodes and characters from the fixed *fabulae* of the mythological tradition.<sup>113</sup> Although the usual neoanalytical challenges of issues of priority and direction of influence apply in these cases (see below),<sup>114</sup> Burgess’ arguments offer an attractive framework for exposing the allusive potential of some early epic repetitions. Most repetitions in epic poetry are, of course, likely to be typological in character, so most of these cases of pointed repetition will involve rarely attested phrases which have come to be associated with specific and identifiable contexts or individuals.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>111</sup> Burgess (2009) 61, (2012); cf. Danek (2002) 17. Barnes (2011) 2-3 similarly suggests that the phrase ἀνδρῶτητα καὶ ἥβην (*Il.*16.857 = 22.363) is ‘traceable to a single source within the epic tradition: the death of Achilles.’

<sup>112</sup> Schein (1984) 91-92; Slatkin (1991) 69-77; Scodel (2002) 140-42; cf. Pind.*Isth.*8.32-34.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Mueller (2009) 172 on Iliadic repetition: ‘particular phrases are much more tightly coupled with particular names than one would expect in a mix-and-match mode of composition’.

<sup>114</sup> Especially problematic is the fact that the phrase μέγας μεγαλωστί also occurs in the *Iliad* of the horseman Cebriones (*Il.*16.776), which might suggest that it is merely context-specific (describing a fallen warrior), rather than character-specific (evocative of Achilles’ death). Burgess (2012) 172-76 offers sensible discussion.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Bakker (2013) 157-69 on his ‘scale of interformularity’: ‘the more specific a formula and/or the more restricted its distribution, the greater the possible awareness of its recurrence and of its potential for signalling meaningful

Early Greek poetry, therefore, should be regarded as able to engage allusively with specific mythological traditions on the levels of both motif and phraseology. In a fluid oral poetic environment, where specific episodes would have been repeatedly re-performed, such engagements were likely multidirectional, as various traditions and story patterns came to influence one another,<sup>116</sup> but we are no longer in a position to discern such intricacies. Currie has objected that this model restricts us to ‘an impersonal and anonymous model of allusion’, in which we cannot conceive of ‘individually authored compositions’ setting themselves apart from others.<sup>117</sup> But this is far from the case: many of the interpretations that follow will show just how sophisticated and agonistic the Homeric poems were in setting themselves apart from the whole tradition.<sup>118</sup> Even if they are not always alluding to a specific poem, this does not deny their own poetic integrity. Nor is this approach designed in principle to rule out the possibility of direct interaction between texts at an early date (see further below). Rather, it prevents us from thinking anachronistically of a mass of neat, self-contained, easily distinguishable epics interacting with each other as the norm in the archaic period.<sup>119</sup> Instead, when dealing with the lost poetic traditions of early Greek poetry, the framework of mythological intertextuality best accounts for the fluid and flexible nature of oral traditions. It is the default paradigm that I will follow in this study.

---

repetition’. Of course, any rare phrase could simply be an under-attested formula, so caution is still necessary in this venture.

<sup>116</sup> Marks (2005) 13-14, (2008) 9-11 on mutual referentiality, citing Pucci’s ‘specular’ readings of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (1987) and Slatkin’s concept of ‘reverberation’ (1991), a term borrowed from Lang (1983).

<sup>117</sup> Currie (2016) 102.

<sup>118</sup> On the agonistic aspect of early Greek poetry: Edwards (1985a) 11-13; Griffith (1990); Collins (2004); Barker (2009). For poetic rivalry in Homer: Martin (1989) 227-30, 238-39; Finkelberg (2003) 75, 78-9, (2011), (2015), (2018) 29-34; Barker – Christensen (2008) 9; Kelly (2008a). Contrast the scepticism of Scodel (2004), (2012) 501. For competition within archaic poetry: *Il.*2.594-600; *Hes. Op.*24-26 on poetic strife (quoted by [Longinus] *De Subl.*13.4 in the context of poetic *imitatio*), *Op.*654-9; *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*; Bacchyl.fr.55. For a concern with the best song and best singer: *Od.*1.350-52; *HhAp.*173.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Louden (2018)’s criticism of Currie: ‘For his arguments to work, we have to assume no other epics existed, save those we have.’

Some scholars, however, might object to the term that I have used for this phenomenon. ‘Mythological intertextuality’ may sound a little misleading or even paradoxical, especially since we are not talking here about interaction with specific ‘texts’. Nevertheless, I believe there are good reasons for retaining this familiar noun. For a start, this usage is closer to Kristeva’s original conception of ‘intertextuality’, in which any cultural product, and not just a literary work, could be considered a ‘text’.<sup>120</sup> But more importantly, this familiar nomenclature is extremely useful, since it highlights the considerable similarity between this kind of *fabula*-based allusion and the text-based allusion with which Classicists are more familiar: both involve a reference to another external source (in contrast to intratextuality: allusion within the bounds of a specific poem). By employing the term here, we thus acknowledge this essential continuity: in both ‘mythological’ and ‘textual’ intertextuality, the underlying allusive process is the same, even if the target of the allusion is different in each case.

## I.2.2 Reconstructing Lost Traditions

Despite its methodological advantages, however, this framework of mythological intertextuality still has to deal with one crucial obstacle that faces any neoanalytical undertaking: namely, our limited access to the rich range of traditions and poems that once populated archaic Greece. Given how little we now have, either in full or in fragments, our gaze is extremely blinkered. In the case of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, our earliest extant Greek texts, this limitation is particularly pressing: how can we talk of allusion in these poems if we have no clear window onto what came before them?<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Kristeva (1980) 36-91. Cf. Burgess (2006) 162.

<sup>121</sup> This problem is equally alive for any attempt to situate Homeric poetry against its larger tradition: e.g. in the case of traditional referentiality, the ‘totality of tradition’ may often only amount to extant Homeric examples, which makes it difficult to determine whether the associations scholars construct are truly pan-traditional, or merely intratextual, an idiosyncratic system of a specific text: Kelly (2007a) 9-10; Cook (2009) 15.

To escape this poverty of evidence, some scholars have recently looked beyond the Greek canon to Near Eastern narratives as a possible ‘source’ of interaction. Numerous parallels of technique, motif and theme have long suggested some kind of connection between Greek and Near Eastern texts, but it remains hotly debated how best to frame the relationship.<sup>122</sup> A growing recent trend, however, is to see Homer and Hesiod ‘directly’ and ‘intentionally’ alluding to the likes of *Gilgameš* and the *Enuma Eliš*.<sup>123</sup> This is an exciting possibility, but there is need (at the very least) for caution. Johannes Haubold has noted that Greek epic (unlike fable) does not advertise itself as engaging with Near Eastern traditions – indeed, the Homeric conception of the world mentions no human society east of Cilicia and the Phoenicians –<sup>124</sup> while historical Greeks, even if they were aware of such traditions, were apparently not concerned with spotting references to them.<sup>125</sup> Nor, we might add, were they even interested in mentioning them: Γίλγαμος appears only once in extant Greek literature, and only then nearly a millennium after Homer at the turn of the second/third centuries CE, in a context divorced from his Mesopotamian epic adventures.<sup>126</sup> Despite the broad cultural

---

<sup>122</sup> Fundamental are Burkert (1992); West (1997). Recent key contributions include López-Ruiz (2010), (2014); Louden (2011); Bachvarova (2016); Kelly – Metcalf (forthcoming). One should acknowledge that the ‘Near East’ is but a convenient (and conventional) label for what is in fact a wide range of different cultures, languages and traditions: Rollinger (2015) 9-10.

<sup>123</sup> Currie (2012), (2016) 160-222; Lardinois (2018), (forthcoming).

<sup>124</sup> Haubold (2011).

<sup>125</sup> Haubold (2013) 20-33. Currie (2016) 200n.283 dismisses the silence of ancient reception as the result of the Homeric scholia’s ‘Greek chauvinism’ and argues instead (pp.200-208) that the *Iliad* shows some interest in the Near Eastern provenance of myths and names, its ‘non-assimilation of origins’ acting as a ‘signal’ of the poet’s debt (203). This, however, is difficult to square with Currie’s alleged major cases of allusion (Achilles ~ Gilgamesh, Aphrodite ~ Ishtar), which lack such ‘non-assimilation’, and instead seem to involve a ‘neutralising’ and ‘assimilative’ ‘refiguration’; precisely where we would want a ‘signal’ to these Near Eastern traditions, we do not find one.

<sup>126</sup> Ael.NA.12.21. Henkelman (2006) 816-49 adduces this passage as evidence for long-lasting oral traditions on Gilgamesh. But he acknowledges the lack of fit with the Mesopotamian epic, and pursues connections with Sargon and Etana instead. Tigay (1982) argues that ‘assumption of ultimate dependence on a Mesopotamian original does not seem compelling’ (p.253) and sees the ‘confusion’ with the story of Sargon as ‘symptomatic of

influence of the Near East on archaic Greece, it is very difficult not to take the general silence of Greek audiences and writers as a sign of disinterest in (or ignorance of) these foreign myths. Moreover, many of the underlying Greek-oriental literary parallels are often not ‘sufficiently compelling’ (Currie’s own criterion: (2016) 174) or close enough to necessitate or even encourage a direct or allusive connection. Although it is ultimately a subjective matter, alternative explanations for similarity often seem more plausible, usually involving closer and more meaningful parallels within a Greek context.<sup>127</sup> The converted would of course respond that allusion always works through creative adaptation and reworking, so we should not expect precise similarity.<sup>128</sup> But differences can eventually become so overwhelming that it simply becomes misleading to continue postulating direct allusion.

More fundamentally, however, this allusive model struggles to give a convincing account for such direct transmission and reception of the Near Eastern poems across time and space. Undoubtedly, ‘historical connections and cultural influence are abundantly attested between archaic Greece and the ancient Near East’,<sup>129</sup> but this alone does not help overcome the vast temporal gap between our earliest Greek texts (eighth-seventh centuries BCE) and many of their Near Eastern counterparts (originally composed in the third-second millennia BCE). Scholars have thus resorted to positing centuries of unattested Near Eastern oral traditions that were detached from, but treated the same myths as, the highly scribal, coded and literary context of our cuneiform texts.<sup>130</sup> Even if such traditions survived for so long, however, it is not easy to imagine how they would have become known to Greek poets, let

---

Gilgamesh’s gradual disappearance into literary oblivion’ (p.255). He also notes that some doubt whether this Γίλαμος is even really *the* Mesopotamian Gilgamesh (p.253n.9).

<sup>127</sup> Most (1998); Kelly (2008b); Metcalf (2015), (2017).

<sup>128</sup> Rollinger (2015) 19n.28; Currie (2016) 174.

<sup>129</sup> Currie (2016) 215, citing Burkert (1992); Morris (1992); Dalley – Reyes (1998); Rollinger (2001). Cf. too West (1997) 1-60.

<sup>130</sup> Oral transmission: West (1997) 593-606; Henkelman (2006); Steymans (2010) 335. George (2003) I.56 also considers possible transmission through now lost literary cultures (Phoenician, early Aramaic). Scholars are generally sceptical of ascribing a role to orality, at least in the original production of our cuneiform texts: e.g. Vanstiphout (1986) 227-28; Vogelzang – Vanstiphout (1992); Foster (2007) 49.

alone their audiences. Scholars have hypothesised the schooling of Greek poets in the East, the arrival of bilingual bards to Greece, and even Greek translations of Near Eastern poetry, all of which are certainly not impossible.<sup>131</sup> But given the complete silence of our sources, any of these ‘solutions’ requires a rather large leap of faith – one which I am not currently prepared to take. I thus side with those who view parallels with Near Eastern texts as the result of long-term interaction and evolution,<sup>132</sup> extremely valuable for tracing the distant prehistory of Greek poetic motifs – and for identifying the distinctive and unique ‘narrative choices’ made by the Greek tradition –<sup>133</sup> but less so for those interested in intertextuality as a phenomenon of performance and reception.<sup>134</sup>

In that case, our evidence for the earlier traditions with which Homer and Hesiod were engaging remains severely restricted. We have no definite knowledge of what tales pre-existed them, or of what specific versions of these tales were in circulation. We are thus compelled to follow the common neoanalytical approach of reconstructing the contours of pre-existing myths and traditions (not poems: see above) from the scraps we have: internal evidence within our extant poems, alongside later artistic, poetic and prose sources. Considerable caution is required in this endeavour, however – and much more than most neoanalytical scholars acknowledge. In particular, there are two major difficulties that complicate this approach.

The first is the post-Homeric date of our evidence: there is every possibility that these texts are simply reacting to and shaping their narratives against the Homeric poems themselves. Later poems may allusively rework a Homeric motif or simply add meat to the narrative bones of a passing reference in Homer – in which case, they cannot reliably provide

---

<sup>131</sup> Currie (2016) 218-20 with further bibliography. What would a Greek ‘translation’ look like? West (2014a) 31-32 imagines a bilingual poet introducing ‘a whole series of *Gilgamesh* motifs into an epic on a Greek mythological theme’, such as Heracles’ labours (cf. West (2018)), but it would be a stretch to call this a ‘translation’.

<sup>132</sup> George (2003) I.57; Allan (2006) 30n.139; Kelly (2008b).

<sup>133</sup> E.g. Haubold (2002) 11-18, (2013) 44-71 on Greek and Akkadian traditions’ different approaches to mortality; Kelly (2014) on Greek epic’s distinctive aestheticization of battle descriptions; Metcalf (2015) 137-150 on differing conceptions of poetic transmission (Greek recall vs. Sumerian and Akkadian writing).

<sup>134</sup> Passivity of Near Eastern influence: Andersen (1998) 139-40; Most (2003) 385; Burgess (2006) 151, (2015) 78-79; Haubold (2013) 11.

us with secure, unmediated access to the coveted pre-Homeric tradition.<sup>135</sup> This is especially true of the Epic Cycle, our evidence for which is late and limited, based on scattered fragments and the summaries of Proclus from the second or fifth centuries CE.<sup>136</sup> It is striking how much early Homeric neoanalysis failed to tackle this problem, and simply assumed as ‘fact’ that the poems of the Epic Cycle reflect pre-Homeric tradition.<sup>137</sup> Recent attempts to treat evidence of any date as an authentic ‘multiform’ are equally problematic, however, since they collapse chronology and impugn later storyteller’s potential for invention.<sup>138</sup> In reality, the later our sources date in time, the greater our problems become: attempts to reconstruct the traces of a pre-Odyssean Argonautic tradition from Apollonius’ *Argonautica* are extremely problematic given how heavily steeped that epic is in the reception and study of both Homeric poems,<sup>139</sup> while the content and attributions of prose mythographers cannot always be taken at face value.<sup>140</sup> Similar difficulties arise, moreover, when the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are mined for evidence of earlier traditions with which they might interact, where there is a latent danger of circularity.<sup>141</sup> The chronological limitations of our evidence are thus a major obstacle, and one which must be taken seriously.

---

<sup>135</sup> Heslin (2011) 356; West (2013) 18-20. Cf. Aristarchus, who supposed that Cyclic poets expanded on passing references in Homeric character-text: Currie (2016) 124-25 with n.115.

<sup>136</sup> On the Cycle: Davies (1989); Burgess (2001a) 7-46; Fantuzzi – Tsagalis (2015).

<sup>137</sup> E.g. Kullmann (1984) 310-11.

<sup>138</sup> E.g. Alwine (2009); Burgess (2017). Others gloss over the problem entirely, e.g. Loney (2014), who employs Apollodorus, Hyginus and scholia for evidence of Promethean traditions suppressed by Hesiod without any acknowledgment of the chronological difficulties.

<sup>139</sup> E.g. West (2005b). Apollonius and Homer: Campbell (1981); Knight (1995). The same can be said of Quintus Smyrnaeus’ *Posthomerica*: Currie (2016) 123-24.

<sup>140</sup> van der Valk (1958); Davies (1986a) 104-9; Cameron (2004) 89-163; Kenens (2011). Though note Dräger (2011)’s argument that Ps.-Apollodorus’ *Library* goes back to a mythographical handbook of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE and faithfully preserves pre-Homeric mythological traditions.

<sup>141</sup> This is particularly clear in attempts to reconstruct ‘alternative’ pre-Homeric versions of Odysseus’ return (§IV.2.2: 199n.34). Goldhill (2007) criticises the ‘grotesque circularity’ of such arguments. Similarly circular is Kopff (1983)’s attempt to reconstruct from the *Iliad* an *Aethiopsis* that he then holds to be the source for our *Iliad*.

The other major chink in the neoanalysts' armour is the subjectivity of their arguments for the priority of one version of a myth over another. This usually depends on assessment of their relative 'suitability', a criterion that can be traced back as far as the work of Zenodotus.<sup>142</sup> Not only must the parallel motifs they trace prove to be more than just typological, but their arguments for fittingness frequently lack any objective, clearly-defined criteria. In particular, are we justified in assuming that a motif's original use will be more suitable and better-fitting than later adaptations, or could a later poet not adapt and improve the application of a pre-existing motif in a new context?<sup>143</sup> Arguments for a motif originally 'belonging' to one specific myth or story must thus be treated with considerable circumspection.

Neither of these issues is insurmountable, however, and with due caution, they can both be overcome. In the case of using post-Homeric evidence, we should be wary of unduly exaggerating the primacy of Homer, at least at an early date. Among many scholars, Burgess has noted that early Greek artists reflected non-Homeric cyclic themes 'much earlier and much more often than they reflected Homeric themes,' suggesting that it was not until the late sixth century that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* came to dominate the tradition. In that case, 'post-Homeric evidence for the pre-Homeric tradition is not necessarily contaminated by Homeric influence, at least not at an early date.'<sup>144</sup> Of course, early epic chronology is a disputed field of research, but this observation at least offers the opportunity for us to see in other sources evidence of traditions that may well have developed before the overbearing shadow of the Homeric poems rose to pre-eminence.<sup>145</sup> More generally, given the limited possibilities for the diffusion of epics at an early date, both through performance and literary circulation, Burgess has also noted that 'relatively late poems are not necessarily influenced by relatively early poems' and that chronologically "'late" poems may well represent mythological traditions that precede "early"

---

<sup>142</sup> Cf. Sittl (1882) 1-2. Zenodotus identified the less suitable instances of repeated lines or phrases to excise them as derivative interpolations.

<sup>143</sup> Page (1961) 206.

<sup>144</sup> Burgess (2006) 150 = (2009) 2, citing his important (2001a) study, esp.35-44. Cf. Snodgrass (1998); Lowenstam (1993), (1997); Cairns (2001a) 6-7.

<sup>145</sup> Early Greek hexameter chronology: Janko (1982), (2012); B. Jones (2010); M.L. West (2012).



poems.<sup>146</sup> Given this situation, it would be overly reductive and dogmatic to preclude the possibility that some post-Homeric evidence might reflect pre-Homeric traditions.

In that case, neoanalytical arguments of priority remain our best tool for identifying such potential pre-Homeric traditions. A degree of subjectivity is impossible to escape (as indeed it is in any allusive interpretation of poetry), but there are some cases in which it would be difficult to deny the transfer of motifs from one character or situation to another. This is especially the case when a motif is particularly rare, or when we encounter a uniquely shared combination of motifs which we can plausibly argue is more appropriate in one context than another. A commonly cited intratextual example within the *Iliad* is the relationship of Diomedes and Achilles. The pair share numerous similarities, from their Hephaestan armour (*Il.*8.195 ~ *Il.*18.369-19.13) and the supernatural fire that surrounds their heads (*Il.*5.4-8 ~ 18.205-14, 225-7) to their theomachic pretensions (*Il.*5.330-54, 841-59 ~ *Il.*21.212-82) and patronage by Athena, a favour shared by nobody else in the poem (*Il.*5.121-23, 290, 793-859 ~ *Il.*20.448-49, 22.214-95).<sup>147</sup> As scholars acknowledge, all these traits ‘fit’ Achilles better, relating to the poem’s central protagonist at the climax of the narrative. Diomedes is thus an ‘anticipatory doublet’, or *altera persona*, of Achilles, displaying elements that primarily ‘belong’ to the Phthian hero.<sup>148</sup> In a case such as this, then, arguments for priority are extremely plausible and enrich our interpretation of the poem. Diomedes exhibits these traits first, but they prove more at home when later repeated of Achilles. In the same way, instances of a motif that appear to us first in Homer may rework other pre-existing traditions or *fabulae*, even if they are only attested for us at a later date.

---

<sup>146</sup> Burgess (2009) 3, cf. (2006) 153.

<sup>147</sup> Schoeck (1961) 75-80; Alden (2000) 169-175.

<sup>148</sup> Burgess (2006) 157, 160, (2009) 63; Tsagalis (2011) 220. Such connections may even extend beyond the strict narrative confines of the *Iliad*, since Diomedes also appears to foreshadow Achilles’ impending death: the Trojan women pray that he might die at the Scaean gates (*Il.*6.305-7), the site of Achilles’ future demise (§III.2.4: 156), and he is injured in the foot by Paris (*Il.*11.369-83), suffering the same injury from the same Trojan that would eventually prove Achilles’ undoing (*Il.*22.359-60; §II.2.2: 69); Burgess (1995) 217 with n.1, 239-40; Christensen (2015a).

Of course, each individual case of such motif transference will have to be assessed on its own merits and treated with extreme care. In some cases, priority might not always be discernible and we may sometimes suppose that different examples of a motif developed simultaneously through mutual interaction. But in at least some instances, this approach will help us exploit later evidence as a guide for potential earlier literary traditions with which Homer and later poets could interact. After all, as Jim Marks has observed, ‘even if the non-canonical evidence...is “post-Homeric,” it still offers our best approximation of the kinds of stories that would have been known to poets [...] and to their audiences.’<sup>149</sup> Certainty is impossible, but it would be overly defeatist and far less interesting to ignore categorically the hints and clues we have from later sources.

### I.2.3 From Myth to Text

The question remains, however, when and how we should transition from this framework of mythological intertextuality to one of full *textual* intertextuality. And more generally, to what extent can we detect a development in allusive practices between the eighth and fifth centuries BCE?

Again, there are no simple answers to this question. But when we turn to Greek lyric poetry of the seventh to fifth centuries BCE, we find an increasingly clear sense of authorship, literary history and engagement with specific texts and authors.<sup>150</sup> This is manifested above all in poets’ direct naming of themselves and their predecessors. Numerous testimonia attest to a growing phenomenon of citing other poets by name. Already in the mid-seventh century, Archilochus (fr.303) and Callinus (fr.6) are said to have ascribed the *Margites* and *Thebais* respectively to Homer, while we are told that Alcman in the late seventh century made explicit

---

<sup>149</sup> Marks (2003) 223.

<sup>150</sup> For allusion in Greek lyric: Fowler (1987) 3-52; Garner (1990) 1-18; Irwin (2005) (General Index, s.v. ‘allusion’, ‘intertextuality’); Budelmann (2018) 16-18; Rawles (2018) 8-12; Spelman (2018a) 177-82.

mention of the poet Polymnestus of Colophon (fr.145). Similarly in the sixth century, a poem of Sappho was apparently composed in response to Alcaeus (fr.137), while Stesichorus is said to have blamed Hesiod and Homer (fr.90), attested that Xanthus predated him (fr.281) and ascribed the *Shield of Heracles* to Hesiod (fr.168). At the dawn of the fifth century, too, Bacchylides apparently called Homer a native of Ios (fr.48), Epicharmus named Aristoxenus of Selinus as the first to introduce a certain type of iambus (fr.77 K–A), and Pratinas reputedly made direct mention of a number of his musical predecessors: Olympus, Thaletas and Xenodamus (713 PMG). Olympus apparently featured again in Pindar (fr.157), who is also said to have mentioned Sacadas of Argos (fr.269), called Homer a Chian and Smyrnaean (fr.264) and ascribed the *Cypria* to him (fr.265). Alongside literary critics' and philosophers' engagement with Homer from the late sixth century onwards (Theagenes of Rhegium, Xenophanes, Heraclitus), this evidence suggests an increasingly strong awareness of distinct and recognisable poetic predecessors.<sup>151</sup>

However, scholars frequently denigrate the value of these preceding examples, since they are all based on indirect testimonia and may only reflect the inferences and biographical fantasies of later readers.<sup>152</sup> Chamaeleon's claim that Stesichorus 'blamed' both Homer and Hesiod, for example, could have simply been extrapolated from the poet's general criticism of the epic tradition and its myths (e.g. fr.91a.1), rather than being based on any direct naming of either poet in Stesichorus' poetry.<sup>153</sup> In some cases, too, potential textual corruption complicates our assessment of the evidence.<sup>154</sup> Yet despite these problems, it would be excessively sceptical to dismiss every single one of these testimonia: not only are some

<sup>151</sup> Theagenes 8 D–K (cf. Biondi (2015)); Heraclitus 22 A 22, B 105 D–K; Xenophanes 21 B 10–12 D–K. Cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 8–11.

<sup>152</sup> Davison (1955) esp. 132–38; Rawles (2018) 24–26. Contrast Janko (1986) 40–42.

<sup>153</sup> E.g. West (1985) 134; Davies – Finglass (2014) 311; Rawles (2018) 24.

<sup>154</sup> E.g. 'Archilochus' in Archil.fr.303 may be an error for Cratinus' *Archilochoi* or for 'Aristophanes', who quotes a phrase from the *Margites* as 'Homeric' (Μουσάων θεράπων, Av.909–10, *Marg.*fr.1 GEF): Davison (1955) 134–36. Or it may only reflect the fact that the same proverbial line featured in both the *Margites* and Archilochus (fr.291): West (1999) 371. Similarly, the Callinus passage depends on emendation of Paus.9.5.5: Θηβαῖς for Θηβαίοις; Καλλῖνος/Καλλίνω for Καλαῖνος/Καλαίνω: Davison (1955) 136–37.

independently confirmed by other evidence,<sup>155</sup> but the general picture they paint is reinforced by numerous examples from our extant lyric texts and fragments in which poets did directly name their forebears.

Alcman may again offer an early example from the seventh century: his description of apparent poetic novelties ([στυ]μαστὰ δ' ἀνθ[ρώποις(ι)]... γαζύματα μαλσακά ... νεόχμ' ἔδειξαν τερπ[ι], Alcman.4 fr.1.4-6) has plausibly been interpreted as a reference to poetic predecessors, potentially including Terpander (τερπ[ι], 4 fr.1.6) and Polymnestus (cf. Alcman.fr.145).<sup>156</sup> Yet it is in the sixth and fifth centuries that extant examples proliferate: Alcaeus explicitly attributes the maxim that 'property makes the man' to Aristodemus, one of the seven sages (Ἀριστόδαμον, fr.360) and may even address Sappho directly (ἰόπλοκ' ἄγνα μελλιχόμειδε Σάπφοι, fr.384).<sup>157</sup> Hipponax directly names Bias of Priene, another of the seven sages (Βίαντος τοῦ Πριηνέως, fr.123). Solon explicitly quotes and criticises a verse of Mimnermus, whom he identifies directly by his patronymic (Λιγιστάδη, fr.20).<sup>158</sup> Bacchylides quotes a saying of Hesiod (Βοιωτὸς ἀνὴρ...Ἡσίοδος, Bacchyl.5.191-4). Corinna explicitly finds fault with Myrtis for competing with Pindar (Μουρτίδ'...Πινδάρου, fr.664a).<sup>159</sup>

<sup>155</sup> Alcman's mention of Polymnestus is rendered more plausible by the fact that the same source ([Plut.] *de mus.*1133a) also claims that Pindar mentioned Polymnestus, an assertion that can be verified by an independent quotation (Pind.fr.188). Similarly, Pindar's claims on Homer's hometown (fr.264) are coupled with an assertion that Simonides called him a Chian ([Plut.] *vit.Hom.*), which is independently confirmed by fr.*eleg.*19.1-2.

<sup>156</sup> Lobel (1957) 23; Davies (1986b); Spelman (2018a) 153 with n.62. Terpander is also cited by Pindar (fr.125), Timotheus (791.225 *PMG*).

<sup>157</sup> Yatromanolakis (2007) 169-71. ἰόπλοκ' evokes a common Sapphic compound: δολόπλοκος (fr.1), μυθόπλοκος (fr.188); Robbins (1995) 231. Sappho's name is elsewhere spelled Ψάπφω in Lesbian (= Sapphic) poetry, which prompted Voigt to follow Maas in printing a different word division (μελλιχόμειδες ἄπφοι, 'sweet-smiling darling', cf. ἀπφῶς, Theoc.*Id.*15.13-15). Even with this reading, however, there would be a clear aural allusion to Sappho's name, as Yatromanolakis (2007) 171 notes. West (1966) 87-88n.3 speculates that Alcaeus may have also named Hesiod in a lost fragment (accounting for the spelling Αἰσίοδος in *Etymologica*).

<sup>158</sup> Λιγιστάδη is Bergk's emendation, but given the quotation and context, a reference to Mimnermus is beyond doubt: West (1974) 182.

<sup>159</sup> Cf. Clayman (1993), although I prefer a pre-Hellenistic dating of the poetess: Silanion's statue of the poetess provides a *terminus ante quem* of the late fourth century (Stewart (1998) 278-81; cf. Collins (2006) 19-20). This

Simonides quotes Pittacus' saying that it is difficult to be good (fr.542), critiques Cleobulus' epigram on Midas' tomb (fr.581), acknowledges Homer and Stesichorus as sources for his account of Meleager (fr.564), and even attributes to the 'man from Chios' a hexameter line from the famous leaves simile of *Iliad* 6.146-49 (fr.*eleg.*19.1-2, cf. ἀν[δρὸς], 11.15-18; Ὅμηρος, 20.14).<sup>160</sup> Yet it is Pindar who refers to the greatest range of predecessors, including Archilochus (*Ol.*9.1-2, *Pyth.*2.54-56), Homer (e.g. *Pyth.*4.277, *Nem.*7.21, *Isth.*4.41, *Pae.*7b.11), Hesiod (*Isth.*6.66-68), Polymnestus of Colophon (fr.188), Terpander (fr.125),<sup>161</sup> and perhaps also Alcman,<sup>162</sup> Arion (*Ol.*13.18), and Xenocritus of Locri ([Λο]κρῶν τις, fr.140b).<sup>163</sup> In some cases, these Pindaric references can even be traced to specific lines of other extant poems (e.g. *Isth.*6.66-68 ~ *Op.*412; *Pyth.*4.277-78 ~ *Il.*15.207; *Nem.*7.21 ~ *Od.*1.4).<sup>164</sup> And to all these examples we could also add instances of poets' self-naming (e.g. Ἀλκμάν, Alcman.fr.17, 39; Ψάπφ(οι), Sapph.fr.1.20, 65.6, 94.5, 133.2), and especially Theognis' assertion of his personal ownership of his collection of verses in his seal poem (Θεὺγνιδὸς ἔστιν ἔπη | τοῦ Μεγαρέως, Thgn.22-23).<sup>165</sup> Alongside the increasing evidence for the use of writing and literacy throughout the

---

poetic instance of 'blaming' (μέμφομαι, fr.664a) may strengthen the possibility that Stesichorus did indeed 'blame' Homer and Hesiod explicitly in his poetry (μέμφεται, fr.90).

<sup>160</sup> Rawles (2018) 28-48 (564 *PMG*), 77-129 (fr.*eleg.*11, 19, 20), 145-9 (542, 581 *PMG*).

<sup>161</sup> Cf. the ethnic Αιολεύς (Pind.fr.191), which has been interpreted as another reference to Terpander: Nagy (1990b) 93n.57; Prauscello (2012) 75-76.

<sup>162</sup> Ἀλκμᾶ[νι], *P.Oxy.*2389 fr.9, col.i.9-10 (= Alcman.TA1a = fr.13a), plausibly ascribed to Pindar: Spelman (2018a) 258-60.

<sup>163</sup> West (1992) 345n.73, (2011b). Cf. Spelman (2018a) esp. 177-278 on Pindar's strong sense of literary history.

<sup>164</sup> Even quotations of mythological personages may point to specific texts, e.g. Adrastus (*Ol.*6.12-17): Pindar's ἀμφοτέρων μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάρνασθαι (*Ol.*6.17) can easily be converted to a full hexameter with a simple change of the verb (μάχεσθαι), suggesting that Pindar was adapting the content of an epic *Thebaid*, as the scholiast in fact claims on the authority of Asclepiades of Myrlea: West (2011b) 53 with n.7.

<sup>165</sup> The textuality of this claim is reinforced by a 'stichometric allusion' to Hesiod's *Theogony*: in both poems, the poet's name appears in verse 22: Renehan (1980) 339-40; Hubbard (2007) 206. Such precise textual imitation seems to presuppose the existence of fixed written texts: cf. Pratt (1995). On stichometric allusion in later poetry: Morgan (1999) 223-29; Hinds (1998) 92n.80; Lowe (2013), (2014).

sixth and fifth centuries,<sup>166</sup> all this evidence suggests that we are very much justified in seeing increasingly greater intertextual engagement with specific texts in this poetry.<sup>167</sup>

In practice, however, any discussion of allusion in Greek lyric still faces many of the same issues that we have already encountered above: not least, whether to prioritise engagement with the limited range of texts we have access to, and how we should negotiate the boundaries of the typological and the specific.<sup>168</sup> When Archilochus describes his seduction of Neoboule in the first Cologne epode (fr.196a), for example, should we conceive of this as a pointed rewriting of Hera's seduction of Zeus in *Iliad* 14, or a broader engagement with the epic type-scene of seduction?<sup>169</sup> Similarly, does Mimnermus fr.2 allude to the leaves simile of *Il.*6.146-49 or to a traditional analogy that is found frequently elsewhere, both in Homer and later texts?<sup>170</sup> So too with the Lesbian poets: does Sappho fr.44 evoke a patchwork of Iliadic passages, or a wider range of Trojan traditions, including not just Hector and Andromache's wedding, but also that of Paris and Helen?<sup>171</sup> And does Alcaeus fr.347 closely rework Hesiod's description of summer in the *Works and Days* (*Op.*582-96), or draw independently on a traditional body of seasonal song, attested elsewhere by a parallel description at [Hes.]*Scut.*393-97?<sup>172</sup> In all these and other cases, we should be wary of unduly privileging the

---

<sup>166</sup> Ancient literacy: Knox (1985); Harris (1989) esp. 45-115; R. Thomas (1992), (2009); Yunis (2003); Missiou (2011). Cf. Rösler (1980) 45-56; Slater (1996); Hubbard (2004); Wright (2012) 141-71; Spelman (2018a) 39-43. On the reception of ancient texts as material entities: Phillips (2016) esp. 9-26.

<sup>167</sup> Cf. too intratextuality within individual poets' oeuvres, especially centred around sequences and cycles of songs, e.g. Archilochus on Lycambes, Alcaeus on his exile, Sappho on her family: Budelmann – Phillips (2018) 18-19.

<sup>168</sup> Some are generally sceptical of the extent of allusion in early Greek lyric: Fowler (1987) 3-52; Kelly (forthcoming). In any case, traditional referentiality can still be fruitfully applied to Greek lyric: e.g. Barker – Christensen (2006).

<sup>169</sup> *Iliad*: Bossi (1973/74) 14-15; Van Sickle (1975) 126-29; Henderson (1976) 165-67. Seduction type-scene: Swift (2015). Fowler (1987) 28-29 remains cautious.

<sup>170</sup> Cf. *Il.*2.467-68, 2.800, 21.464-66; *Od.*7.104-6, 9.51; Musaeus fr.5 D-K; Bacchyl.5.63-67; *Ar.Av.*685-87. Allusion: Griffith (1975); Fowler (1987) 32; Garner (1990) 3-8. Scepticism: Burgess (2001a) 117-22.

<sup>171</sup> *Iliad*: Rissman (1983) 119-41; Meyerhoff (1984) 118-39; Schrenk (1994); Bowie (2010a) 71-74; Xian (forthcoming). Trojan traditions: Suárez de la Torre (2008); Spelman (2017); Scodel (2017b); cf. Steinrück (1999). See §II.3.3: 106-7.

<sup>172</sup> Allusion: Page (1955a) 306; West (1978) 61 with n.2; Rösler (1980) 256-64; Fowler (1987) 37-38; Tsomis (2001) 151-54; Bing (2009) 154n.12; Hunter (2014) 123-25. Popular tradition: Hooker (1977) 80-81; Nagy (1990b) 462-63n.121;

few texts that we still possess over the broader tradition, but this should not stop us from arguing for direct allusion when the context and content of the passages justify it. In the case of Alcaeus' summer scene, for example, the parallels between the Alcaean and Hesiodic passages are so numerous and precise that a merely indirect connection seems improbable. On closer examination, the arguments for a traditional motif are also not particularly compelling: the *Aspis* parallel passage is more likely another 'echo' of the *Works and Days* (even self-consciously marked as such through the recurrence of the 'echoing' cicada: ἡχέτα τέττιξ, *Scut.*393),<sup>173</sup> a means to increase its own 'Hesiodic' texture, rather than an independent manifestation of a recurring motif. In this case, therefore, it is plausible to read Alcaeus' fragment as a pointed appropriation of Hesiod's paraenetic posturing, marking his generic difference to and distance from Hesiod's far longer didactic epic.

In recent years, however, several scholars have attempted to downdate the origins of extensive textual intertextuality to the time of Stesichorus in the sixth century, a poet whom they perceive as marking a particularly significant watershed in the development of poetic allusion.<sup>174</sup> It is true that Stesichorus does offer us several plausible cases of precise engagement with Homeric epic, often with apparently rarer moments of Homeric narrative: the comparison of Geryon's drooping head to a poppy echoes the *Iliad's* similarly poignant description of Gorgythion's head (*Geryoneis* fr.19.44-47 ~ *Il.*8.306-8);<sup>175</sup> Geryon's mother baring her breast recalls Hecuba's same action before Hector (*Geryoneis* fr.17 ~ *Il.*22.83); and Telemachus' departure from Sparta replays events from the *Odyssey* (*Nostoi* fr.170.1-11 ~ *Od.*15.1-184). Such precise engagement can also be traced in Stesichorus' successors, not only in the three famous epinician poets (Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar), but also Ibycus, whose Polycrates Ode

---

Martin (1992) 22-23; Jocelyn (1993); Petropoulos (1994) 17, 81-82; Bershadsky (2011) 11-13 (who compares *Ar.Pax* 1159-71, *Av.*1088-1100).

<sup>173</sup> Bing (2012) 186-87. Cf. Stamatopoulou (2013) 283-84. Alcaeus' cicada in fr.347 may itself 'summon to mind the aesthetics of repetition with variation': Spelman (forthcoming) §1. To his examples of poet as cicada, add the original Hesiodic scene (Rosen (1990b) 107-10).

<sup>174</sup> Kelly (2015a), cited approvingly by Ormand (2017).

<sup>175</sup> Cf. Fowler (1987) 35-36; Garner (1990) 14-18.

plausibly makes sophisticated use of the Iliadic *Catalogue of Ships* and Hesiod's *Works and Days*.<sup>176</sup>

However, to posit Stesichorus as a dramatic point of change overplays the novelty of such precise references and underplays the significance of earlier Stesichorean predecessors, such as Alcaeus. We have already noted his precise verbal engagement with Hesiod, but we could also cite his fr.44, which appears to evoke the key theme of the *Iliad*: in its fragmentary state, we see a son call to his Naiad mother who then supplicates Zeus on the subject of her son's wrath (μᾶνιν, fr.44.8 ~ μῆνιν, *Il*.1.1); it is difficult to deny a reference to our *Iliad* or at least an Iliadic tradition here.<sup>177</sup> Moreover, scholars' sceptical arguments about earlier texts can also be turned against their own Stesichorean examples: in the case of *Geryoneis* fr.19, for example, Kelly himself notes that flower similes are common in early Greek epic, while the image of each poppy simile is considerably different: in Stesichorus, the flower sheds its leaves; while in Homer, it is weighed down by the weight of fruit and rain.<sup>178</sup> In addition to this, we could add that arrows likely played a larger role in other epic material, especially in traditions featuring Philoctetes and Heracles, so the shared instrument of death need not be particularly distinctive or marked. And Kelly's argument that the Iliadic model is a rare and obscure episode, in comparison to earlier lyricists' engagement with more mainstream, marquee-episodes, is undermined by its simile form – it is a far more vivid and memorable moment than Kelly supposes. All this is not enough, I believe, to dismiss this Stesichorean allusion, but it goes some way to highlighting the subjectivity inherent in any argument for or against allusion in early Greek poetry. For any particular example, the case can be made both ways.

It is not possible, therefore, to pinpoint a specific watershed moment at which we can start talking of precise intertextual engagements rather than allusion to more general mythological traditions. Indeed, returning to the world of archaic epic, it is even possible that we should not entirely rule out the possibility of direct textual intertextuality even in our

---

<sup>176</sup> Barron (1969); Steiner (2005); Stamatopoulou (2016) 49-51.

<sup>177</sup> Meyerhoff (1984) 46-53; Page (1955a) 281-3; Fowler (1987) 37; West (1995) 206-7, (2002) 209. Contrast Kelly (2015a) 25-27, who acknowledges his 'excessive or even mischievous scepticism'.

<sup>178</sup> Kelly (2015a) 36. Epic flower similes: Kelly (2007a) 289-90.



earliest extant texts. Scholars have long noted the elaborate intratextual connections within individual epic poems, especially in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*'s large-scale repetitions of speeches and similes, even over vast distances (*Il.*15.263-68 = 6.506-11; *Od.*17.124-46 ~ 4.333-50, 4.556-60; *Od.*23.157-61 = 6.230-34).<sup>179</sup> It is difficult to deny Currie's conclusion that 'each poet knows his own poem as a fixed text, and recalls part of it by quoting specific lines.'<sup>180</sup> And if such fixity and 'sense of text' is possible within an individual work, it is difficult to resist extending it to a poet's engagement with other poems.<sup>181</sup> This alone does not permit us to reconstruct a host of lost 'fixed' archaic epics, for the reasons we have discussed above. But when exploring the relationships of our extant texts, it would be overly restrictive to deny the possibility of direct contact at some points. And this, indeed, is what a number of scholars have found. The Hesiodic corpus, for example, is marked by a number of close connections, especially between the *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, whose relationship borders on 'deliberate cross-referencing':<sup>182</sup> not only do both poems feature Hesiod's pseudo-biographical relationship to the Muses from Mount Helicon (*Theog.*22-35, *Op.*658-59) and both treat the myths of Prometheus and Pandora in a complementary diptych with numerous verbal parallels (e.g. *Op.*48 ~ *Theog.*546, 565; *Op.*70-72 ~ *Theog.*571-73),<sup>183</sup> but the beginning of the *Works and Days* also appears to self-consciously 'correct' the *Theogony*'s claim that there was only one Strife (*Op.*11-26 ~ *Theog.*225-26).<sup>184</sup> Similar intertextual links have also been identified in the wider canon of archaic Greek epic, both between the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and Homer, and

<sup>179</sup> See e.g. Lohmann (1970); Bannert (1988); Di Benedetto (1994) 177-238; Reichel (1994); Bakker (2017).

<sup>180</sup> Currie (2016) 17.

<sup>181</sup> Homer's 'sense of text': Dowden (1996).

<sup>182</sup> Nelson (2005) 333; cf. Blümer (2001) I.93-106, II.63-64, 137-200; Clay (2003) 6-8.

<sup>183</sup> Vernant (1974) 177-94 = (1980) 168-85; Clay (2003) 100-28; cf. Σ Hes.*Op.*48.

<sup>184</sup> Self-correction signalled by οὐκ ἄρα: Most (1993) 77-82 (suspecting the use of writing; cf. Pucci (1977) 140-41); Scodel (1996) 72-77 (suspecting a further reference to *Op.*656-9), (2001) 122; Blümer (2001) II.35-38. Contrast Sinclair (1932) 3; Rowe (1978) 104; Hooker (1992) 50-51; Zarecki (2007) 11-14, who, however, sees in ἐτήμυτα μυθησάμεν (*Op.*10) a further allusion to *Theog.*27-28.

between the *Homeric Hymns* and a number of other early Greek hexameter poems.<sup>185</sup> Admittedly, in some cases, these connections may still be better explained as instances of mythological intertextuality or traditional referentiality.<sup>186</sup> Yet these examples – especially Hesiod’s intertextual diptych – are extremely suggestive for an early sense of (relatively) fixed textuality in the poetic world of archaic Greece.

The most controversial case, however, remains the relationship of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. There are many parallel passages between the two epics,<sup>187</sup> and a number of scholars have made plausible cases for seeing allusive connections between their structure, language and motifs.<sup>188</sup> In particular, it has often been argued that the fraught relationship of Achilles and Odysseus in both poems self-consciously reflects the competition between their respective epics, as each hero is defined against the other: the figure of βῆ against that of μῆτις – certainly an attractive hypothesis.<sup>189</sup> It is understandable that some might shrink from arguing for direct allusion between these poems, given the apparently oral setting of archaic epic. And there is, after all, no smoking gun. Yet by reading the pair in dialogue, I believe that already here we can gain a richer reading and an attractive narrative of literary *aemulatio*.

To contemplate such a relationship, however, we must tackle the remarkable fact that neither poem directly mentions any event from the other, a phenomenon customarily known

---

<sup>185</sup> *Catalogue*: Ormand (2014) 119-80. *Hymns*: Faulkner (2008) 31-40; Brillet-Dubois (2011); Thomas (2011) 168, (2017) 77-81; Olson (2012) 16-24, 279-81; Baumbach (2012) 137-38; Hunter (2012), 94; Maravela (2015).

<sup>186</sup> E.g. Aphrodite’s bathing at Paphos (*HhAphr.*58-63) – perhaps directly lifted from *Od.*8.362-66 (e.g. Baumbach (2012) 137-38), but more likely an independent manifestation of an ‘allurement scene’ (Forsyth (1979)), or an evocation of the *fabula* of (or hymnic poetry on) Aphrodite’s seduction of Anchises and her pseudo-seduction of Paris (Currie (2016) 147-60).

<sup>187</sup> Gemoll (1883); Usener (1990); West (2014a) 70-77.

<sup>188</sup> Burkert (1960); Pucci (1979), (1987) esp. 17-18; Goldhill (1991) 93-108; Korenjak (1998); Schein (1999); R.B. Rutherford (2001); Di Benedetto (2001); Currie (2006) 7-15, (2016) 39-47; West (2014a) 25-27; Minchin (2018). Occasionally, the *Odyssey* is thought to have priority (Scott (1911); Shewan (1913); Pucci (1987) 42n.23; Tsagalis (2008) 135-49). Others see a continuous agonistic dialogue between both poems (Wilson (2002); Lentini (2006); Mazur (2010)).

<sup>189</sup> Thalmann (1984) 182; Edwards (1985a); Wilson (2005); Currie (2016) 46 with n.46; Grethlein (2017).

as ‘Monro’s Law.’<sup>190</sup> Only the mixing of Achilles’ and Patroclus’ bones may offer an exception to this phenomenon (requested by Patroclus’ shade at *Il.*23.82-92, and recalled by Agamemnon’s at *Od.*24.73-84), but even this is an event that strictly lies outside the main narrative of both poems.<sup>191</sup> Page once concluded from this absence that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* developed in complete isolation from each other,<sup>192</sup> but given the length and similar subject matter of both, it is difficult not to interpret the complete avoidance of each other’s narrative content as deliberate.<sup>193</sup> After all, the monumental scale of both poems sets them apart from other early Greek epics we know of, while the pair also display an unusually high degree of complementarity. While we can trace numerous contradictions and differences of detail between the Cyclic epics and Homer, the contents of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are strikingly consistent and compatible.<sup>194</sup> Indeed, Foley and Arft have argued that ‘overlap and even contradiction’ are ‘natural and expectable’ in a multiform, pre-textual tradition.<sup>195</sup> The absence of both in this case is extremely telling. Moreover, when taken as a pair, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* appear to offer an extremely convenient survey of the whole Trojan war: in its main narrative

---

<sup>190</sup> Monro (1901) 325.

<sup>191</sup> Nagy (1979) 21. Ford (1992) 158-60 argues that the *Odyssey*’s pointed exclusion of Antilochus from this mingled burial (*Od.*24.78) marks a dismissal of *Aethiopis* traditions and pinpoints the *Iliad*, but we have no evidence that Antilochus was more closely buried with Achilles in another tradition. In Proclus’ summary of the *Aethiopis* (*Aeth.*arg.4a), the Achaeans treat each corpse separately, burying Antilochus (θάπτουσι), and laying out Achilles (προτίθενται).

<sup>192</sup> Page (1955b).

<sup>193</sup> E.g. Kirk (1962) 299-300; Nagy (1979) 20-21; Pucci (1987) 17-18. For later cases of such ‘negative intertextuality’, cf. Spelman (2018a) 102n.59 on the general avoidance of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in the Epic Cycle, Stesichorus, Pindar and Bacchylides.

<sup>194</sup> Cycle and Homer: Both the *Cypria* (*Cypr.*arg.12c) and *Iliad* (*Il.*2.816-77) contain catalogues of Trojan allies; they disagree on where Chryseis was captured (Lyrnessus: *Il.*2.688-93, 19.59-60, 295-96; Pedasus: *Cypr.*fr.23) and on the duration of Paris’ voyage from Sparta to Troy (*Il.*6.289-92, *Cypr.*fr.14: cf. *Hdt.*2.116-7). Cf. inconsistencies and overlaps in the Cyclic poems: Ajax’s suicide features in both the *Little Iliad* (*Il.**Parv.*arg.1b) and *Aethiopis* (*Aeth.*fr.6); Astyanax is killed by Odysseus in the *Sack of Ilion* (*Il.**Pers.*arg.4a), but by Neoptolemus in the *Little Iliad* (*Il.**Parv.*fr.29).

<sup>195</sup> Foley – Arft (2015) 78.

and cross-references, the *Iliad* treats the first sack of Troy to the death of Achilles, while the *Odyssey* picks up from that point until the end of Odysseus' story. This complementarity was already recognised in antiquity: Homer in the *Odyssey* was said to have filled out what was left out of the *Iliad* (τὰ λελειμμένα).<sup>196</sup> But given how seamlessly and coherently the two epics cover the whole Trojan war narrative, this unity certainly seems intentional and premeditated.

Of course, those who remain sceptical could still argue that the *Odyssey* is merely familiar with many episodes of the *fabula* of Achilles and the Trojan war, and the *Iliad* similarly with the *fabula* of Odysseus' returns,<sup>197</sup> but – in my view – the extent of the connections encourages something greater in this case – that the poet of the *Odyssey* could have been familiar with the *Iliad* as a distinctive text, or at least with the distinctive contours of an Iliadic tradition. Such fixity would not necessarily depend on writing, but it would equally not preclude it: the excavation of the cup of Acesander at Methone has recently provided further evidence that poetry was recorded in writing by the mid-eighth century BCE.<sup>198</sup> We should not, however, take this relationship as the norm for early Greek allusion: indeed, our foregoing discussion has highlighted the limitations of that approach. But rather, these strong links between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* show that both mythological and textual intertextuality could co-exist at an early date – much as specific and generic allusion could co-exist in later Latin poetry.

In my discussion of Greek epic and lyric that follows, therefore, I will be exploring cases of both mythological and textual intertextuality. My instinct is to assume engagement with mythical *fabulae*, rather than texts, especially when dealing with the lost traditions underpinning both Homeric poems, unless a particularly strong case can be made for direct textual interaction. But as we proceed to Greek lyric, potential cases of direct allusion will become more numerous. The indexing of such allusions (to *fabulae* and/or texts) will be the

---

<sup>196</sup> Hunter (2018) 190.

<sup>197</sup> Edwards (1985a) 8-9 considers such a stance 'the most skeptical view'.

<sup>198</sup> Janko (2015) 23-27, comparing the Dipylon oenochoe, Nestor's Cup and a cup with three hexameters from Eretria. He concludes that 'by this time, alphabetic writing could be used to record poetry on more serious occasions and at far greater length'.

main focus of this study, but I will also stay attuned throughout to the traditional referentiality of individual words and phrases. In this way, we will best be able to appreciate the rich texture of archaic Greek allusion.

\* \* \*

With this framework and these considerations in mind, then, it is time to turn from theory to practice. In each of the sections that follow, we shall explore the various ways in which archaic Greek poets indexed their allusions to both traditions and texts. Throughout, I shall follow the practice of many modern scholars in supposing an ideally competent audience, whose previous exposure to tradition has equipped them with the prior knowledge necessary to appreciate poets' allusive interactions.<sup>199</sup> Of course, ancient audiences – like those today – would have varied widely in capabilities and interests, but this should not limit us to pursuing the lowest common denominator of interpretation. And nor does an oral context of performance preclude the reception and appreciation of such allusions: modern music, theatre and film offer many examples of clearly detectable allusions mid-performance.<sup>200</sup>

As a final caveat, I shall also be imputing a significant degree of self-reflexivity into these archaic texts, going beyond a naturalistic reading of scenes to detect an additional layer of self-consciousness. In particular, I shall often read the poet's external motivation into the words of his characters, an approach that blurs the narratological distinction between primary (extradiegetic) and secondary (intradiegetic) narrators.<sup>201</sup> Some might challenge such a reading and object that a character's words are 'just' directed to their internal audience, and that it is unwarranted to jump from an internal character's speech to what the poet implicitly 'says' to his external audience. Yet this relies on a false dichotomy between 'naturalistic' and 'self-

---

<sup>199</sup> Danek (2002) 4, 19; Kelly (2007a) 12-13; Currie (2016) 29-30; Spelman (2018a) 182. For dramatic audiences, cf. Revermann (2006).

<sup>200</sup> E.g. the Musical *Wicked*, a self-conscious 'prequel' to the *Wizard of Oz*, where we find numerous, often extremely subtle, foreshadowings of 'later' events within the play's fictional world.

<sup>201</sup> Intra-/extra-diegetic narrators: de Jong (2014) 20.

conscious' interpretations of poetry, a distinction that is often mapped onto that of 'archaic' and 'modern' literature. On closer inspection, however, ancient Greek texts, from Homer onwards, are manifestly self-conscious: scholars have long admired the embedded songs of the *Odyssey*, the meditation on artistic creation in the Homeric shield ecphrasis, and the self-reflexive figuring of the Homeric poet in his characters, including Odysseus, Calchas and Nestor.<sup>202</sup> In the case of embedded speeches, too, there is no reason to deny such self-conscious interpretations. Characters' words are, after all, still the product of – and shaped by – their narrator, and so they can always be interpreted on multiple levels: both internally (as an address within the story world of a poem) and externally (as an address to audiences beyond it). Such a suggestion is not, I should add, a radical departure from interpretative norms. Phoenix's Meleager exemplum in *Iliad* 9 has long been interpreted in such a manner: internally, as a speech that aims to exhort Achilles back to the battlefield, and externally, as an authorial nod to Achilles' impending demise at the hands of Apollo.<sup>203</sup> In this study, I intend to extend this approach further, exploring how characters' (and narrators') words reach beyond their immediate context. By doing so, we will be able to gain a richer appreciation of archaic Greek poetics.

---

<sup>202</sup> Cf. §I.1.3: 16n.45. Embedded song: Rinon (2006). Ecphrasis: de Jong (2011). Odysseus: Beck (2005); Kelly (2008a) 178n.5. Calchas/Nestor: Dickson (1992).

<sup>203</sup> E.g. Nagy (1979) 102-11; Burgess (2017) 62.

## **PART II.**

### **THE PRE-ALEXANDRIAN FOOTNOTE**





## II.1 Introduction

In this section, I shall explore the early Greek precedent for the most famous and frequent index of allusion in Roman poetry, the 'Alexandrian footnote'. As we have seen, Latin poets often signposted their allusions to and departures from tradition through vague appeals to the transmission of talk and hearsay. By prefacing their allusive references with vague gestures to others' words, they signposted their intertextual gestures, appropriating, challenging and creatively reworking the authority of tradition.

In the chapters that follow, I argue that this same indexical potential is already manifest in archaic Greek poetry's engagement with hearsay and its transmission. From Homer onwards, archaic poets evoke, confront and revise what others have previously 'said'.



## II.2 Epic *Fama*

In the world of archaic epic, fame and renown played a prominent role. Both Homeric poems convey a strong impression of tales and traditions circulating between individuals and communities. This is especially visible in the *Odyssey*, where we witness the stories of the Achaeans' returns recounted by Phemius, Nestor and others, as well as Telemachus' active quest to seek news (ἀκουήν, *Od.*14.179) of his father's fortunes. Yet even in the *Iliad*, stories of the past circulate continuously: characters repeatedly appeal to a range of past tales as paradigms for their own circumstances, including the former deeds of Bellerophon, Meleager and Niobe. Nor is this concern with the telling of tales limited to a retrospective concern with the past; it also looks to the present and future. In both epics, Homer's characters are intimately concerned to preserve their own κλέος, a word which is often translated as 'fame', 'renown' or 'reputation', but which etymologically means 'that which is heard' (cf. κλύω). Heroes may win κλέος on the battlefield (*Il.*5.3, 18.121), in athletic contests (*Od.*8.147-48) or even for fine words in council (*Od.*16.241-42). And throughout Homeric society, there is a recurring concern with how future generations will hear of and judge their actions (note especially the repeated verse-end ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι, 'for future generations to hear').<sup>1</sup> Even objects can enjoy a κλέος of their own, often through elaborate stories attached to them, such as Agamemnon's sceptre (*Il.*1.234-39) or Meriones' boar-tusk helmet (*Il.*10.261-70).<sup>2</sup> In the words of one critic, the Homeric universe is bound together by 'an elaborate network of gossip, rumor, and reputation.'<sup>3</sup> It is κλέος which drives heroic activity. And it is κλέος which eventually becomes memorialised in song.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Il.*2.119, 22.305; *Od.*11.76, 21.255, 24.433. Cf. *Il.*6.357-58; *Od.*8.577-78, 24.196-202.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Griffin (1980) 1-49; Grethlein (2008) 35-43.

<sup>3</sup> Olson (1995) 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Achilles singing κλέα ἀνδρῶν (*Il.*9.189). On epic κλέος: Nagy (1974) 244-55; Redfield (1975) 31-35; Olson (1995) 1-23; Petropoulos (2011) 1-89; Hardie (2012) 48-67; González (2015) 117-172.

Throughout both Homeric poems and archaic Greek epic more generally, characters often appeal to these circulating traditions in vague and generalised terms through verbs of hearing and speaking, especially the third person plural φασί.<sup>5</sup> In current scholarship, such gestures are often interpreted as a component of a larger epic contrast between reliable first-hand experience and the indirect transmission of hearsay.<sup>6</sup> Since these appeals to tradition are primarily found in the mouths of mortal characters, who often acknowledge their lack of direct autopsy, they are thought to reflect the limitations and fallibility of human knowledge, a foil to the omniscient and divinely-authorised perspective of the epic narrator.<sup>7</sup> In the invocation of the Muses in *Iliad* 2, the poet famously remarks that ‘you are goddesses and are present and know all things, whereas we hear only a rumour and know nothing’ (ὕμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστε τε ἴστε τε πάντα, ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν, *Il.*2.485-86). As Andrew Ford has argued from this and other such passages, the ‘fiction’ of the Muses conceals the reality of bardic education and transmission, freeing Homer – unlike his characters – from needing to rely on ‘mere’ κλέος.<sup>8</sup> By presenting matters in this way, Homer is said to establish his own poetry’s κλέος as superior to other socially-embedded, self-interested forms of oral report.<sup>9</sup>

There is certainly an element of truth to this opposition, but it is overly reductive to restrict every instance of φασί to such rhetorical posturing. After all, the same idiom also appears in the mouths of epic narrators (*Il.*2.783, 17.674; *Od.*6.42; *Theog.*306; *Op.*803-4),<sup>10</sup> alongside a number of other remarks which acknowledge the limitations of their knowledge

<sup>5</sup> φασί(v) appears in the *Iliad* (21x), *Odyssey* (21x), *Theogony* (1x), *Works and Days* (1x), *Homeric Hymns* (3x), and at least one epic fragment. de Jong (2004) 237-38 offers a useful list of the Homeric examples, grouped into four main categories that reflect her narratological priorities.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Ford (1992) 57-67; Mackie (2003) 68-69.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Agócs (2011) 200. O’Maley (2011) contrasts contestable hearsay with reliable memory. See de Jong’s B1 category: (2004) 237-38.

<sup>8</sup> Ford (1992) 61-63, 90-130

<sup>9</sup> E.g. Ford (1992) 57-67, 91-92; Scodel (2001) 110-12. Cf Kelly (2008a), (2018b).

<sup>10</sup> A fact ignored by Mackie (2003) 69, who claims that ‘the Homeric poet himself, never does, and never would, legitimate his own narrative in this way’ [sc. by grounding ‘the validity of his tale in its traditional character’].

(*Il.*12.176, 17.260-61; *Theog.*369).<sup>11</sup> A straight dichotomy between mortal ignorance and poetic omniscience simply cannot hold. Nor does inspiration from the Muses deny poets' independence: it is clear from the *Odyssey* that this is conceived as a familiar instance of 'double determination,' involving both divine and human agency.<sup>12</sup> Phemius famously declares that he is both self-taught and the recipient of divine aid (αὐτοδίδακτος δ' εἰμί, θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν οἶμας | παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν, *Od.*22.347-48), while Alcinous' description of Demodocus makes it clear that his poetry is both god-given and the product of his own θυμός (τῷ γάρ ῥα θεὸς πέρι δῶκεν ἀοιδὴν | τέρειν, ὅππῃ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνῃσιν αἰεῖδεν, *Od.*8.44-45). The poet's divinely-inspired status, therefore, is not opposed to but rather complements his own poetic craftsmanship on the mortal plane. However hard Homer tries to conceal his fallibilities behind the smokescreen of the Muses, he ultimately cannot avoid embracing and engaging with other traditions and 'what men say'.

In fact, on closer examination, Homeric uses of φασί and other related expressions, in both the narrator's and characters' mouths, often highlight connections with other traditions and stories, playing an important role in situating each epic within the larger mythical traditions of archaic Greece. Far from simply downgrading other forms of speech, appeals to rumour and hearsay mark an engagement with larger traditions of myth and poetry. In this chapter, I shall explore the indexical potential of these appeals. I argue that scenes in which characters talk of receiving and transmitting news serve as a model for how we conceive of epic poets' own intertextual relationships, as they gesture to and incorporate other traditions.

We shall focus first on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, exploring the two main ways in which indexical hearsay functions in Homeric epic: first, as an acknowledgment of the poet's encyclopaedic mastery of tradition (§II.2.1); and second, as an agonistic gesture to suppressed

<sup>11</sup> Cf. de Jong (2004) 47-49. The Homeric passages (*Il.*12.175-78, 17.260-61) have been suspected by ancient and modern scholars. But it is a *petitio principii* to claim that Homer does not indulge in any self-reference, and then remove all lines which do not fit this view. Both passages can be amply defended: the scholia identify Ὀμηρικὴ ἐνάργεια in *Il.*12.175-78; Edwards (1991) 88 notes poetic expansion in *Il.*17.260-61.

<sup>12</sup> Murray (1981) 96-97; Verdenius (1983) 37-40; de Jong (2004) 52, (2006) 191-93; Ritoók (1989) 342-44; Kelly (2008a) 194n.48. On double determination: Lesky (1961); Pelliccia (2011).

narrative alternatives (§II.2.2). We shall begin by examining how these indexes function in character speech, before turning to their comparable use in the narrator's own voice (§II.2.3). To conclude, we shall broaden our perspective by comparing this Homeric pattern to the use of this device in the wider corpus of early Greek epic (§II.2.4).

### II.2.1 The Authority of Tradition

When Homer's characters appeal to hearsay, they often point to details of the mythical tradition that are established and familiar. Even if – within the internal story world – their gesture may reflect their limited first-hand knowledge, it can also be read as the poet's invocation of the authority of epic tradition, marking his own encyclopaedic mastery of it.

In *Odyssey* 4, for example, Peisistratus reminisces about his dead brother Antilochus, whom 'men say was above all others preeminent in speed of foot and as a warrior' (περὶ δ' ἄλλων **φασὶ** γενέσθαι | Ἀντίλοχον, περὶ μὲν θείειν ταχὺν ἡδὲ μαχητὴν, *Od.*4.201-2). Within the internal story world, this remark reflects Peisistratus' lack of direct acquaintance with his brother's exploits, given that he was not himself present at Troy to see them (οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γε | ἦντησ' οὐδὲ ἶδον, *Od.*4.200-1), but it also evokes the Trojan war traditions through which Antilochus' fame has reached him and with which Homer's audience would have been familiar. The Pylian youth played a significant part in the war as a close friend of Achilles, especially after Hector's killing of Patroclus. In particular, his death at the hands of the Ethiopian Memnon was a prominent feature of the larger tradition, a key episode in the later Cyclic *Aethiopsis* (*Aeth.*arg.2c) and one which the Homeric narrator has just recalled with the loaded language of memory (**μνήσατο, ἐπιμνησθεῖς**, *Od.*4.187-89, §III.2.1: 134-35). Peisistratus' appeal to hearsay acknowledges the central role that his brother played in the mythical tradition.

The emphasis on Antilochus' speed, however, points not so much to the hero's duel with Memnon as to his more general reputation as a runner in the wider tradition. In the *Iliad's*

footrace, he is introduced as the fastest of all the Achaean youths (ὁ γὰρ αὐτε νέους ποσὶ πάντας ἐνίκᾳ, *Il.*23.756), while Menelaus earlier claims that he is unmatched in his youth, speed and valour, paralleling Peisistratus' description of his brother's key traits (οὐ τις σεῖο νεώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν, | οὔτε ποσὶν θάσσων, οὔτ' ἄλκιμος ὥς σὺ μάχεσθαι, *Il.*15.569-70). Elsewhere in the *Iliad*, moreover, Antilochus is called a 'swift warrior' (θοός...πολεμιστής, *Il.*15.585), a phrase used only once elsewhere in Homer of Aeneas, another hero renowned for his speed,<sup>13</sup> while his agility is repeatedly stressed in his key contribution to the *Iliadic* narrative: his delivery of the news of Patroclus' death to Achilles (θᾶσσον ἰόντα, *Il.*17.654; βῆ δὲ θέειν, *Il.*17.698; πόδες φέρον, *Il.*17.700; πόδας ταχύς, *Il.*18.2). Although we do not have other evidence for his depiction elsewhere in archaic Greek epic, such a character trait was presumably an established feature of Antilochus in the Trojan war myth, not just limited to the *Iliad*. After all, earlier in the *Odyssey*, Nestor has already described his son in precisely the same terms as Peisistratus does here, suggesting that the attributes are formulaic and traditional (Ἀντίλοχος, πέρι μὲν θέειν ταχύς ἡδὲ μαχητής, *Od.*3.112 ~ *Od.*4.202). It is, moreover, especially appropriate for Antilochus to share a major attribute of his companion, 'swift-footed' Achilles (e.g. Ἀχιλλῆα πόδας ταχύν, *Il.*13.348).<sup>14</sup> Peisistratus' appeal to hearsay in *Odyssey* 4, therefore, looks beyond the immediate narrative to point to Antilochus' pre-eminence as a runner in the wider Trojan tradition. By indexing another element of the epic cycle, Homer signals not just his allusion to other features of the Trojan war narrative, but also his mastery over the mass of mythical material at his disposal.

This incorporative aesthetic is a recurring feature of indexical hearsay. On many occasions, Homer similarly indexes other details of tradition, acknowledging the broader context in which his own poetry is situated. In the *Iliad*, Aeneas emphasises his familiarity with his own and Achilles' ancestry as what they both 'know' from 'hearing the ancient legends told by (or 'about') mortal men' (ἴδμεν...πρόκλυτ' ἀκούοντες ἔπεα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, *Il.*20.203-4), a comment which – as Edwards notes – can easily be taken as a reference 'to epic

<sup>13</sup> Notably, as he flees from Antilochus: *Il.*5.571. 'Swift-footed Aeneas': Fenno (2008) 158.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Dunkle (1997) 231.

poetry celebrating the exploits of the two heroes.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, such a reference is reinforced by the use of the noun ἔπεα: not just ‘words’ in general, but also ‘poetic’ or even ‘epic utterances’.<sup>16</sup> Alongside the mention of ἄνθρωποι (‘men’), commonly singled out as the audience of epic poetry elsewhere,<sup>17</sup> Aeneas’ emphasis on the fame and antiquity of these ἔπεα highlights the epic traditionality of his and Achilles’ lineage.

In the *Odyssey*, meanwhile, the protagonist’s resourcefulness and cunning is similarly acknowledged as an established feature of tradition: Telemachus claims that ‘**they say**’ (φάσ’) his father is pre-eminent in wiles (μῆτιν, *Od.*23.124-26), while when Odysseus reveals his identity in Phaeacia, he similarly asserts that he is ‘**an object of concern to all men**’ for his tricks (δόλοι) and that his ‘**fame** reaches the heavens,’ employing language that mirrors Circe’s later allusive nod to Argonautic myth (ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν | ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει, *Od.*9.19-20; cf. Ἀργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα, *Od.*12.70).<sup>18</sup> These comments point to the well-established tradition of Odysseus as the arch-deviser of the Trojan war myth, a reputation reflected in his formulaic epithet πολύμητις (‘of many wiles’), and more than deserved by his role in such episodes as the ambushes of Dolon, Rhesus and Helenus, as well as his various spying missions in Troy and the mobilisation of the Wooden Horse (*Il.*10.338-579; *Il.Parv.*arg.2a, 4b-d; *Od.*8.500-20). These indexes highlight the traditionality of Odysseus’ cunning, while also perhaps acknowledging the *Odyssey*’s own role in cementing it.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Edwards (1991) 315.

<sup>16</sup> Thus Nagy (1979) 271, Chap.15§7. On this meaning of ἔπος, cf. §IV.3.1: 211n.70 Cf. Martin (1989) 16 who highlights the close association of ἔπος with the audition and transmission of words.

<sup>17</sup> §II.2.2: 67-68.

<sup>18</sup> For this Argonautic allusion: §I.1.3: 17. For μέλω of literary concern, cf. Thgn.245-7 (μελήσεις | ...ἀνθρώποις... | Κύρνε); Thgn.1058 (<μέλω>μεν δ’ ἀμφιπερικτίσιν). The noun ἀνθρώποισι also points to poetic audiences: §II.2.2: 67-68; cf. ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους, *Od.*23.125.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. e.g. the verbal play with Οὐ τις / μή τις (‘nobody’) and μῆτις (‘cunning’) in Odysseus’ encounter with Polyphemus, esp. *Od.*9.414.



In both Homeric poems, therefore, indexical appeals to hearsay invoke the authority of tradition, highlighting the poet's control and mastery of the larger mythical canon.<sup>20</sup> On occasion, such self-aware citation of tradition may even extend to direct textual allusion. Our most plausible case comes from the *Odyssey*, when Telemachus reports to Mentor-Athena that Nestor has been king for three generations of men (*Od.*3.243-46):

νῦν δ' ἐθέλω ἔπος ἄλλο μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι  
 Νέστορ', ἐπεὶ περὶ οἶδε δίκας ἡδὲ φρόνιν ἄλλων·  
 τρὶς γὰρ δὴ μὶν **φασιν** ἀνάξασθαι γένε' ἀνδρῶν·  
 ὥς τέ μοι ἀθάνατος ἰνδάλλεται εἰσοράσθαι.

On an internal level, this reference to Nestor's age emphasises his wisdom and authority. He is a reliable source of information for Telemachus to consult. Such fabled seniority is the very kind of thing that Telemachus would have doubtless heard stories about as he was growing up on Ithaca, so **φασίν** makes natural sense within the story world. Yet as scholars have long recognised, this description of the Pylian king also closely resembles his opening description in the *Iliad* (*Il.*1.250-52):

τῷ δ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων  
 ἐφθίαθ', οἳ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἡδ' ἐγένοντο  
 ἐν Πύλῳ ἡγαθέη, μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσαν.

This similar treatment of Nestor's triple rule was noted by ancient and Byzantine scholars: the Odyssean scholia remark that Telemachus' sentiment 'has been composed from the phrase in the *Iliad*', while Eustathius comments that 'the poet succinctly paraphrases what was said about Nestor at more length in the *Iliad*.'<sup>21</sup> Of course, the two passages are not identical, and

<sup>20</sup> Cf. too **φάσαν**, **φασί** (*Il.*4.374-75) ~ Theban myth (Torres-Guerra (1995) 33; Vergados (2014) 438-39); **φασ'** (*Il.*23.791) ~ traditions of Odysseus' old age (*Od.*11.136, *Telegony*); **φασί** (*Od.*3.84-85), **σεῖο μέγα κλέος αἰὲν ἄκουον** (*Od.*16.241-42) ~ Odysseus' martial prowess; **πενθόμεθ', πεύθομαι, φάσ', ἀκούετε** (*Od.*3.87, 3.187, 3.193) ~ *Nostoi* traditions; **φασί** (*Od.*18.261) ~ Trojans' military might.

<sup>21</sup> *παρὰ τὸ ἐν Ἰλιάδι πεποιήται "μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσαν", Σ Od.3.245a. παραφράζων συντόμως ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ ἐν Ἰλιάδι περὶ Νέστορος πλατύτερον ἱστορηθέν, Eust.Od.1465.43f. = I.124.5-6 Stallbaum.*

scholars have long been vexed by a slight discrepancy between them: on a literal reading, Nestor appears to have only ruled for one generation in the *Iliad*, but three in the *Odyssey*.<sup>22</sup> However, Grethlein has recently highlighted the essential consistency between both passages: in each case, Nestor is pictured as having ruled over his own generation, as well as those of his children and grandchildren. The resulting timeframe skews both epics' implicit chronology (seemingly interposing another generation between Nestor and his sons), but in both passages this can be accounted for as an exaggeration to reinforce Nestor's authority.<sup>23</sup> Given this similar hyperbole and the shared emphasis on Nestor's age, experience and wisdom, it would be tempting to see the *Odyssey* here alluding directly to the *Iliad*. Telemachus would then be justifying his exaggerated claim through appeal to the precedent of the *Iliad*, signposted through the seemingly general *φασί*ν. After all, the Iliadic passage derives from Nestor's very first appearance in that poem, part of a memorable description of the Pylian king's mellifluous speech which aligns him with other representatives of song, including the Muses, epic bards and the Sirens (*Il*.1.248-49).<sup>24</sup> It is – to use a phrase familiar from later periods – a 'purple patch' that could easily stick in an audience's mind (cf. *Hor. Ars P*.14-19). By evoking it here, Homer and Telemachus would draw on literary precedent to authorise their exaggerated claim about Nestor's age, gesturing to the fuller prior account of the *Iliad*: a truly 'brief paraphrase', as Eustathius claimed.<sup>25</sup>

Such a direct connection is certainly possible, and one that I would not want to rule out. It is likely, however, that such a characterisation of Nestor's seniority and triple-rule would not have been restricted to these two places in the archaic epic tradition.<sup>26</sup> We have

---

<sup>22</sup> Σ *Od*.3.245a; Leaf (1886–88) I.16; Kirk (1985) 79.

<sup>23</sup> Grethlein (2006b). Contrast West (2014a) 71 ('an egregiously unsuccessful attempt to reproduce the sense of A 250-2').

<sup>24</sup> Thalmann (1984) 140-42; Dickson (1995) 45-100; Papaioannou (2005) 64. For the unusualness of this character introduction: Alden (2000) 74.

<sup>25</sup> ἔπος ἄλλο μεταλλῆσαι (*Od*.3.243) could even pre-empt this allusion: literally 'ask about another matter', but also 'search after another epic' (i.e. the *Iliad*).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Danek (1998) 90-91.

already explored his well-established place in the mythical canon (in relation to the Nestor's Cup inscription, §I.2.1: 30-32) and we shall later turn to his central role as a repository of tales and stories, a status for which his age and experience are crucial (§IV.2.1: 196-98). On this occasion, it is thus more plausible to see Telemachus evoking a more general motif of Nestor's seniority, a motif that ran throughout the Greek epic tradition, rather than a specific nod to its Iliadic manifestation. Whichever way one prefers to read the reference, however, we should acknowledge that **φασί** again marks Homer's allusion to the legitimising authority of tradition. Like the previous indexes we have examined above, the device situates Homer's poetry within a larger map of myth, highlighting the poet's encyclopaedic mastery of his mythical repertoire.

## II.2.2 Contesting Tradition

In other Homeric cases, characters' appeals to hearsay bear a far more agonistic edge, not just acknowledging the wider tradition, but directing an audience to specific elements of it that Homer has pointedly suppressed or diverged from.

In the *Iliad*, such combative positioning is especially centred around the figure of Achilles. When Eurypylus claims that **'they say'** (**φασί**) Patroclus learnt his knowledge of healing herbs from Achilles, who in turn learnt it from Cheiron (*Il.*11.830-32), the poet nods to the tradition of Achilles' tuition by Cheiron, a fantastical version of the hero's upbringing which Homer tends to downplay elsewhere.<sup>27</sup> More polemical, however, is Agenor's assertion of Achilles' mortality, that **'people say** he is mortal' (*Il.*21.568-70):

καὶ γὰρ θην τούτῳ τρωτὸς χρώς ὁξεί χαλκῶ,  
 ἐν δὲ ἴα ψυχῇ, θνητὸν δὲ ἔ**φασ'** ἄνθρωποι  
 ἔμμεναι· αὐτὰρ οἱ Κρονίδης Ζεὺς κῦδος ὀπάζει.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Robbins (1993); Mackie (1997); Cairns (2001a) 39-41.

Unlike all the other examples we have discussed so far, this **φασί** is unusual since it does not lack a nominative agent, prompting de Jong to group it under her category (A) of φασί-utterances, those ‘with definite subject’.<sup>28</sup> Yet ἄνθρωποι (‘mankind’) hardly provides much more precise specification than the usual anonymous use of φασί; it is an ill fit when grouped alongside other specified subjects such as the Trojans (*Il.*9.234), Ajax’s comrades (*Il.*17.637), the suitors (*Od.*2.238), the Phaeacians (*Od.*7.322) or Odysseus’ father and son (*Od.*11.176). The apparently superfluous ἄνθρωποι thus lays unusual stress on the phrase. On the one hand, this may play on the subject of the talk: ‘mortals’ claim that Achilles is ‘mortal’. But it is also significant that the noun ἄνθρωποι indicates the audience or propagators of poetry elsewhere in early Greek epic: Helen and Paris will be the subject of song for men of future generations (ἀνθρώποισι...ἀοιδίμοι ἐσσομένοισι, *Il.*6.358); Odysseus claims that he is the subject of song among men because of his trickery (πᾶσι δόλοισιν | ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, *Od.*9.19-20); and Agamemnon’s shade claims that Clytemnestra will be a hateful song among men (στρυγερή δέ τ’ ἀοιδὴ | ἔσσειτ’ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους, *Od.*24.200-1).<sup>29</sup> It is thus tempting to treat this **φασί** as an invitation for Homer’s audience to consider other poetic traditions surrounding Achilles and questions of his (im)mortality: ‘men say’ that Achilles is mortal, but are they right?<sup>30</sup> As with Achilles’ tuition from Cheiron, **φασί** here appears to allusively acknowledge but simultaneously reject an alternative tradition in which Achilles was more than mortal.

<sup>28</sup> de Jong (2004) 237-38.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Nagy (1979) 37, §13n.4 on epic’s conventional link between ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους and κλέος. Admittedly, ἄνθρωπος is a common noun in Homer, but it usually occurs in an explicit contrast between mortals and gods, a contrast which is lacking in all these metapoetic cases. Cf. *Il.*20.204 (ἔπεα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων: §II.2.1: 63-64); *Od.*11.274 (ἀνάπυστα...ἀνθρώποισιν: Barker – Christensen (2008) 24: §I.1.3: 17); *Od.*24.197-98 (ἐπιχθονίοισιν). Later lyric examples include Thgn.245-46 (μελήσεις ἀφθιτον ἀνθρώποις αἰὲν ἔχων ὄνομα); Pind.*Pyth.*3.112 (ἀνθρώπων φάτις: §II.3.1: 92), *Dith.*1.fr.70a.15 (λέγοντι...βοοτοί: §II.3.1: 92-93n.91); Ibyc.fr.303 (φᾶμις...βοοτῶν: §II.3.3: 107-9).

<sup>30</sup> Note too the hesitation implied by θήν (equivalent to the particle δὴ: Denniston (1954) 288), conveying a sceptical or ironical tone: Denniston (1954) 229-36, esp. 234: it ‘often denotes that words are not to be taken at their face value...δὴ often gives the effect of inverted commas.’

Of course, direct evidence for the tradition of Achilles' immortality is attested only far later. The first extant instances of Thetis' attempts to immortalise Achilles occur in the Hellenistic period, with passing references in Dosiadas' *Altar* (σποδεύνας ἱνις Ἐμπούσας, AP 15.26.3) and Lycophron's *Alexandra* (178-79, with Tzetz. *ad Alex.*178). Apollonius of Rhodes offers a fuller account in his *Argonautica* (4.869-79), but this seems to draw heavily on Demeter's similar treatment of Damophon in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, which complicates any attempt to trace the myth's earlier history.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, the Styx-dipping tradition, the most famous aspect of the myth in modern popular-culture, appears first in literature only in Statius (*Ach.*1.133-34, 268-70, 480-81), and even later in art.<sup>32</sup> It is thus possible that traditions of Achilles' immortality are a post-Homeric invention. Indeed, some scholars suspect a Hellenistic origin for the myth.<sup>33</sup>

Despite our late and limited evidence, however, it is likely that earlier traditions did exist surrounding Thetis' concern over Achilles' mortality and the hero's subsequent invulnerability.<sup>34</sup> The obliqueness and brevity of Statius' triple allusion to the Styx story suggest that the poet was drawing on an already familiar tradition, which he even indexed through temporal adverbs (*saepe, iterum*, *Ach.*1.133-34). This alone would not rule out a Hellenistic origin for the myth, but there are strong grounds for tracing it back earlier. Invulnerability was a common attribute of other heroes in archaic myth,<sup>35</sup> and we can find a number of hints that it was also applied to Achilles at an early date: Thetis' attempts to immortalise her children by Peleus were already recounted in the Hesiodic *Aegimius* (Hes.fr.300), and we know that Achilles already enjoyed quasi-immortality in the *Aethiopis* with his afterlife on the White Isle (*Aeth.*arg.4b). The *Iliad* itself also conceals a veiled allusion

<sup>31</sup> For Apollonius' linguistic and thematic debts to the *Hymn*: Richardson (1974) 237-38; Hunter (2015) 202-4.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Burgess (2009) 9 with n.9, citing *LIMC*, s.v. 'Achilleus', nos.5-18.

<sup>33</sup> Robert (1920-26) 67-68, 1187; Burgess (1995) 222; Heslin (2005) 167, (2016) 94-96. Weitzmann (1959) 54-59 even hypothesised a lost Alexandrian *Achilleis* as Statius' source.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Davies (2016) 67-71.

<sup>35</sup> Burgess (1995) 219n.6 lists Ajax, Asterus, Caeneus, Cycnus, the Nemean lion, Talos and possibly Meleager. We could add Memnon and Tithonus (§II.3.3: 109 with n.136).

to Achilles' heel and the hero's associated invulnerability in its treatment of Diomedes' foot-wound from Paris (*Il.*11.369-83), part of Diomedes' larger adoption of Achillean traits in the first half of the poem (§I.2.2: 41). Various hints in archaic poetry thus suggest that the myth was of considerable antiquity. Such a conclusion can be bolstered further, however, by a neoanalytical case of priority. A number of scholars have argued that the Apollonian 'immortalisation by fire' is more appropriate to Achilles than Damophon, and thus cannot be wholly derived from the *Homeric Hymn*.<sup>36</sup> The logic of the myth appears to be that fire burns off the infant's mortal half, leaving only his immortal nature,<sup>37</sup> and as Burgess notes, it is Achilles, not Damophon, who 'is semidivine, and so could logically become immortalised if his mortality were burned away.'<sup>38</sup>

It is thus plausible that traditions about Thetis' attempted immortalisation of her son existed already in the archaic period and that Homer's original audiences may well have been aware of them.<sup>39</sup> Homer's general silence on this specific tradition would be in keeping with his suppression of immortality elsewhere in the *Iliad*, so as to emphasise the stark dichotomy between short-lived mortals and the immortal gods.<sup>40</sup> Yet by having a character insist on the hero's mortality with an indexical **φασί**, the poet acknowledges this alternative tradition, while pointedly highlighting his denial and divergence from it.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Burgess (1995) 221 with n.13, (2001b) 216 with n.9, (2009) 102; Mackie (1998).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Heracles: *Theoc.Id.*24.82-83; *Ov.Met.*9.251-53, 262-70. For fire's deifying power: Edsman (1949).

<sup>38</sup> Burgess (2009) 102; Mackie (1998) 337.

<sup>39</sup> Some suspect that the story could have featured in the *Cypria*: Severyns (1928) 258; Mackie (1998) 331n.9. It may be a step too far to argue that Agenor even echoes language traditionally attached to this *fabula*: τρωτὸς χρώς ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ (*Il.*21.568) closely parallels and inverts *Ach.*1.481 (*pulchros ferro praestruxerit artus*), but it cannot be proved that Statius' phrasing derives from earlier tradition, rather than this very Homeric passage.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *Il.*3.243-44 on the Dioscuri (contrast *Od.*11.299-304); *Il.*18.117-19 on Heracles (contrast *Od.*11.601-4; *Theog.*950-55; *Hes.fr.*25.25-33, *fr.*229.6-13, *Hh*15.7-8: Barker – Christensen (2014)). For the *Iliad*'s emphasis on mortality and death: Griffin (1977) 42-43; Schein (1984) 67-88; Edwards (1985b) 215-18; Burgess (2009) 102-3.

<sup>41</sup> Later poets reassert the immortality tradition: see Heslin (2016) on Ovid's polemical 'correction' of Homer.

The same agonistic strategy is also in play when Homer situates his own poetry against other traditions of poetry and myth beyond those of the Trojan war. A prime example is the relationship of the *Odyssey* to female catalogue poetry. Scholars have long suggested that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* presuppose earlier traditions of female catalogue poetry familiar to us from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*: Finkelberg has argued that Ajax's appearance in the list of Helen's suitors (Hes.fr.204.44-51) lies behind his entry in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (Il.2.557-58),<sup>42</sup> while Rutherford has highlighted various correspondences between the *Catalogue of Women* and other poems in the early epic tradition, especially the catalogue of heroines in the Odyssean *Nekyia* (Od.11.225-329).<sup>43</sup> However, the *Odyssey's* engagement with catalogue poetry is first signalled far earlier in the poem, during the Ithacan assembly of book two. Antinous, in his frustration at Penelope's devious tricks for delaying the suitors' advances, claims that she is unrivalled, even among women of a former age (Od.2.115-22):

εἰ δ' ἔτ' ἀνιῆσει γε πολὺν χρόνον υἷας Ἀχαιῶν,  
τὰ φρονέουσ' ἀνὰ θυμόν, ὃ οἱ πέρι δῶκεν Ἀθήνη  
ἔργα τ' ἐπίστασθαι περικαλλέα καὶ φρένας ἐσθλὰς  
κέρδεά θ', οἷ' οὐ πῶ τιν' ἀκούομεν οὐδὲ παλαιῶν,  
τάων αἰ πάρος ἦσαν εὐπλοκαμίδες Ἀχαιαί,  
Τυρῶ τ' Ἀλκμήνη τε εὐστέφανός τε Μυκίνη·  
τάων οὐ τις ὁμοῖα νοήματα Πηνελοπείη  
ἦδ' ἄτάρ μὲν τοῦτό γ' ἐναΐσιμον οὐκ ἐνόησε.

Antinous here compares Penelope with three women of the distant past: Tyro, Alcmene and Mycene, all of whom occupy prominent positions in Greek myth as the ancestors of many of its most famous heroes. In mothering Aeson, Pheres, Amythaon, Pelias and Neleus (Od.11.254-59), Tyro in particular counts numerous heroes from the Trojan, Theban and Argonautic sagas in her lineage, including Melampus, Jason, Admetus, Adrastus and Nestor; Alcmene was the mother of Heracles, whose numerous affairs ensured a plentiful progeny; and Mycene, the

<sup>42</sup> Finkelberg (1988), though note the caution of Cingano (1990), (2005) 143-51.

<sup>43</sup> Rutherford (2000) 93-96, (2012); cf. Gazis (2018) 125-56. The corresponding Tyro entries exhibit numerous close parallels: Hes.fr.30.35 ~ Od.11.240; fr.31.2-3 ~ Od.11.249-50; fr.32 ~ Od.11.243-44. Cf. Most (1992) on the *Nekyia* as a literary-historical catalogue of the subspecies of *epos*.

eponymous heroine of Mycenae, was a significant ancestor in the Argive family tree as the mother of Argus, guardian of Io. By claiming Penelope's superiority to such eminent figures of the mythological and literary past, Antinous inadvertently highlights her obvious appeal to the suitors: on this logic, whoever succeeds in wooing her will enjoy an illustrious and unsurpassed progeny. As Danek notes, however, the comparison also exposes the suitors' own *hybris*: all three of these mythical women had divine lovers, so if Penelope is superior to them, she is completely out of the suitors' league.<sup>44</sup>

Besides this unintentional and ironic reflection on the suitors' situation, however, Antinous' direct contrast between Penelope and these other mythical women also activates a more allusive contrast between the *Odyssey* and female genealogical poetry. All three of Antinous' *comparanda* also feature prominently in Hesiodic Catalogue poetry: Tyro appears first in the Odyssean *Nekyia* and conspicuously in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (*Od.*11.235-59; *Hes.frr.*30-32), while we find Alcmene in both lists (*Od.*11.266-68; *Hes.frr.*193.19-20, *fr.*195.8-63 = *Scut.*1-56), and in the *Great Ehoiai* (*Hes.frr.*248), where Mycene is also said to have featured (*Hes.frr.*246).<sup>45</sup> Given the close combination of these women here, Antinous' words thus point towards pre-existing female catalogue traditions, just like Odysseus' in the *Nekyia*. The likelihood of a reference to such traditions is further reinforced by the very nature of these lines: by listing the women in a miniature catalogue, Antinous repeats the compositional technique of *Ehoiai* poetry itself, while the word with which he introduces them, the relative pronoun οἷα (*Od.*2.118), acts as a generic signpost, echoing the common introductory formula of such poetry (ὅ οἷα).<sup>46</sup> Antinous' comparison thus imitates the key features of Hesiodic catalogue poetry at the very same time as he evokes some of its principal protagonists.<sup>47</sup>

The allusive nature of these verses is sealed, however, by their indexical framing: Antinous introduces these women by appealing to hearsay (ἀκούομεν) and antiquity

---

<sup>44</sup> Danek (1998) 74.

<sup>45</sup> On the relationship between the *Ehoiai* and *Great Ehoiai*: D'Alessio (2005a).

<sup>46</sup> Skempis – Ziogas (2009) 234.

<sup>47</sup> Compare also οὗ πῶ τινα' (*Od.*2.118) ~ οὗ πῶ τις (*Hes.frr.*195.17, see below), a parallel which further highlights the degree to which Alcinoos appropriates the rhetoric of female catalogue poetry.



(παλαιῶν, πάρος). The names of these women have reached him through transmitted tales, while their very age marks the venerability of these traditions and heightens the contrast with the present. Stephanie West remarks that ‘the antiquarian note’ of these lines ‘is slightly strange’,<sup>48</sup> yet viewed as indexes of allusion, their function is clear: once more, appeal to hearsay signposts allusive interactions.<sup>49</sup> After all, as Sammons notes, the suitors are themselves ‘aficionados of epic poetry.’ As regular audience members of Phemius’ songs (*Od.*1.325-27), it is no surprise if they derive their knowledge from older song traditions.<sup>50</sup>

Given this evocation of Hesiodic Catalogue poetry, Antinous’ comparison thus does much more than simply highlight Penelope’s desirability (and objectionable craftiness). It also sets her Odyssean self against other poetic traditions. In asserting her superior handiwork, knowledge and cunning (attributes which make her a prime match for Odysseus), Antinous agonistically indicates the superiority of the tale in which she features: nobody before has been quite like her; and just as Penelope surpasses these women of the past, so too does the *Odyssey* trump the Hesiodic tradition of female catalogues.<sup>51</sup> Antinous’ ensuing claim seals this agonistic one-upmanship: Penelope is winning great κλέος for herself (μέγα μὲν κλέος ἀντιῇ | ποιεῖτ’, *Od.*2.125-26). As she surpasses the likes of Tyro and Alcmena, she too joins the ranks of those who are the subject of song in their own right.<sup>52</sup>

The polemic of this comparison, however, is heightened when we consider how these Hesiodic women were themselves presented as unrivalled paragons of womanhood. The Hesiodic *Catalogue* explicitly sets out to list those women who were ‘the best at that time [and

---

<sup>48</sup> West (1988) 139 on *Od.*2.120.

<sup>49</sup> In this regard, one might wonder whether the frequent use of φασι in discussions of ancestry in early Greek epic could point to larger traditions about heroic genealogies, as exemplified by the *Catalogue*: e.g. *Il.*5.635, 6.100, 20.105, 20.206, 21.159; *Od.*1.220, 4.387, 18.128.

<sup>50</sup> Sammons (2010) 61n.8.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Sammons (2010) 60.

<sup>52</sup> Compare Agamemnon on Penelope’s enduring κλέος and future song: *Od.*24.196-98.

most beautiful on the earth]’ (αἱ τότε ἄρισται ἔσαν [καὶ κάλλισται κατὰ γαῖαν], Hes.fr.1.3),<sup>53</sup> and both Tyro and Alcmene are further celebrated as flawless models of femininity in their own entries in the *Catalogue*: Tyro surpasses all female women in beauty (εἶδος | [πασάων προὔχεσκε γυναι]κῶν θηλυτεράων, Hes.fr.30.33-34), while Alcmene receives a particularly lavish encomium (Hes.fr.195.11-17 = *Scut.*4-10):

ἥ ῥα γυναικῶν φύλον ἐκαίνυτο θηλυτεράων  
 εἶδεῖ τε μέγεθει τε· νόον γε μὲν οὐ τις ἔριζε  
 τάων ἅς θνηταὶ θνητοῖς τέκον εὐνηθεῖσαι.  
 τῆς καὶ ἀπὸ κρηθὲν βλεφάρων τ’ ἄπο κυανεάων  
 τοῖον ἄηθ’ οἷόν τε πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης.  
 ἥ δὲ καὶ ὥς κατὰ θυμὸν ἔδν τίεσκεν ἀκοίτην,  
 ὥς οὐ πώ τις ἔτισε γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων

In part, these verses draw on traditional elements of epic encomium: εἶδος and μέγεθος are frequently combined in the praise, criticism or description of an individual’s physique, alongside other nouns such as δέμας and φωνή.<sup>54</sup> The image of wafting beauty, meanwhile, is paralleled elsewhere in the *Catalogue* (fr.43a.73) and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (HhDem.276). Yet the larger focus here on Alcmene’s νόος and marital fidelity are uncommon in such descriptions: φρένες are sometimes picked out for praise,<sup>55</sup> yet the only other mention of νόος in such contexts is Odysseus’ negative dismissal of Euryalus’ ‘stunted mind’ during the Phaeacian games of *Odyssey* 8, in comparison to his outstanding looks (εἶδος μὲν ἀριπρεπές...νόον δ’ ἀποφώλιος, *Od.*8.176-77). The Hesiodic poet’s emphasis on this attribute here, then, in notably combative terms (οὐ τις ἔριζε, Hes.fr.195.12), highlights Alcmene’s exceptionality. So too does the ‘honour’ which she pays to her husband, an expression which

<sup>53</sup> Merkelbach’s proposed supplements here and in fr.30.34 reinforce my argument. But even if we leave the lacunae unsupplemented, these verses still display an emphasis on pre-eminence (ἄρισται, fr.1.3) and physical appearance (εἶδος, fr.30.33).

<sup>54</sup> *Il.*2.58; *Od.*5.217, 6.152, 14.177, 24.253, 24.374; *HhDem.*275; *HhAphr.*85. Cf. *Il.*23.66, where tradition is adapted to describe Patroclus’ ghost (μέγεθός, ὄμματα, φωνή).

<sup>55</sup> *Il.*1.115; *Od.*4.264, 11.337, 14.178, 17.454, 18.249.

finds no direct parallel in the early Greek tradition,<sup>56</sup> although there is perhaps an underlying touch of irony given her coming ‘affair’ with Zeus during Amphitryon’s absence.<sup>57</sup> In any case, if these two traits (her intelligence and fidelity) were particularly associated with Alcmena in early genealogical traditions, as the uniqueness of these lines may suggest, Antinous’ use of her in the *Odyssey* as a foil to Penelope has even more point. Not only does Penelope surpass the best women of the past, but she eclipses even her closest rival in wit and marital loyalty. She too displays an unparalleled facility with κέρδεα (2.118), an attribute that is ‘arguably a defining theme of the *Odyssey* itself.’<sup>58</sup>

This emphasis on Penelope’s incomparability recurs several times later in the *Odyssey* with a similarly agonistic point. When speaking to the disguised Odysseus on his return to Ithaca, Penelope wishes to be judged preeminent among other women for her wit and prudent counsel (δάσσειαι εἴ τι γυναικῶν | ἀλλῶν περιέειμι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα μῆτιν, *Od.*19.325-26). But it is especially Telemachus’ compliments before the bow contest in *Odyssey* 21 which resonate with Antinous’ earlier words (*Od.*21.106-9):

ἀλλ’ ἄγετε, μνηστῆρες, ἐπεὶ τόδε φαίνεται ἄεθλον,  
οἷη νῦν οὐκ ἔστι γυνή κατ’ Ἀχαιῖδα γαῖαν,  
οὔτε Πύλου ἱερῆς οὔτ’ Ἀργεος οὔτε Μυκῆνης,  
[οὔτ’ αὐτῆς Ἰθάκης οὔτ’ ἠπειροῖο μελαίνης.]

Like Antinous’ former praise, these verses evoke key features of Hesiodic *Catalogue* poetry: the οἷη (*Od.*21.107) nods to the formula of catalogue poetry, like οἷα in book 2,<sup>59</sup> while the very context of these lines – the wooing of a woman and the idea of a woman as a prize (ἄεθλον) –

<sup>56</sup> The only close parallel is the honour Alcinous shows to his wife Arete in Phaeacia (*Od.*7.66-70), although here the genders are reversed.

<sup>57</sup> Hes.fr.195.34-63 = *Scut.*27-56; cf. Diod.Sic.4.9, *Apollod.Bibl.*2.4.8. The mention of her dark eyebrows may also suggest an erotic context: compare Ibycus’ description of Eros (κυανέοισιν...βλεφάροις, fr.287.1-2).

<sup>58</sup> Sammons (2010) 60-61, citing Katz’s observation ((1991) 4) that the attributes in *Od.*2.117 are formulaic (cf. the Phaeacian women, *Od.*7.111), whereas the enjambed κέρδεα are a unique addition.

<sup>59</sup> Nasta (2006) 63-64; Skempis – Ziogas (2009) 233-34.

resonates with many of the common themes of the catalogic genre.<sup>60</sup> Here too, Penelope is thus set against the traditions of the *Catalogue* and comes out on top. Yet these lines also have a closer connection with Antinous' earlier words. The initial trio of cities which Telemachus lists are all intimately linked with Antinous' own exempla: Tyro's descendants ruled Pylos (Neleus/Nestor); Alcmene was herself from Argos, while her son Heracles was frequently imagined as the ruler of the locality; and the city of Mycenae drew its very name from the maiden Mycene.<sup>61</sup> Telemachus' words thus not only evoke traditions of female catalogue poetry, but also recall the implicitly agonistic intertextuality of the earlier episode. After all, he ends by claiming that the suitors themselves '**know**' of Penelope's incomparability (καὶ δ' αὐτοὶ τόδε γ' ἴσταν, *Od.*21.110), a remark that almost acknowledges their familiarity with Antinous' earlier words. The initially signposted contrast with another literary tradition and its paradigmatic representatives thus continues to resonate through the whole poem.

Indexical appeals to hearsay in Homer, therefore, not only flag and signpost allusion, but also mark a deeply agonistic engagement with other traditions. As in later Latin poetry, the device is used to mark out a larger map of poetic territories within and against which a poet defines himself. The device exhibits not only an encyclopaedic but also an agonistic drive. In the following section, we shall see how this same combination of nuances co-exist in the poet's own voice.

### II.2.3 The Poet's Voice

---

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Skempis – Ziogas (2009) 234n.59, whose examples include Atalanta (*Hes.*fr.72-76), Mestra (*fr.*43a.21) and Helen (*fr.*196-204).

<sup>61</sup> This reading may lend additional support to West's deletion of *Od.*21.109, which introduces Ithaca and the mainland, places which are unnecessary for the catalogic allusion. The line is absent in many manuscripts and could have been adapted from *Od.*14.97-98.

The first instance of *φασί* in the *Iliad*, and one of the few in the narrator's voice, well emblematises both these aspects of indexical hearsay. It occurs at the end of the Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* 2, within a pair of climactic similes that connect the events unfolding on earth with the supernatural strife of Zeus and Typhoeus (*Il.*2.780-85):

οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἴσαν ὥς εἴ τε πυρὶ χθὼν πᾶσα νέμοιτο·  
 γαῖα δ' ὑπεστενάχιζε Διὶ ὥς τερπικεραύνῳ  
 χωομένῳ ὅτε τ' ἀμφὶ Τυφωεῖ γαῖαν ἰμάσση  
 εἰν Ἀρίμοις, ὅθι **φασὶ** Τυφώος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς.  
 ὥς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγα στεναχίζετο γαῖα  
 ἐρχομένων κτλ.

Scholars have long admired the artistry of these lines, which close the Greek catalogue with an elaborate ring-composition, echoing the series of similes with which it opened: the scorched land of verse 780 generalises and extends the devastation of the forest fire at *Il.*2.455-58, while the earth groaning beneath the Greeks' feet recalls the earlier emphasis on the din of their steps (αὐτὰρ ὑπὸ χθὼν | σμερδαλέον κονάβιζε ποδῶν αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἵππων, *Il.*2.465-66). Yet these lines themselves also offer a miniature ring-composition of their own: the chiasmic arrangement of γαῖα δ' ὑπεστάνιζε ... στεναχίζετο γαῖα is framed in turn by two verbs describing the Greeks' advance (ἴσαν, ἐρχομένων).<sup>62</sup> Less attention has been paid, however, to the unobtrusive *φασί* clause in verse 783, an aside which attributes part of the Typhoeus tale to the anonymous talk of men.

Eustathius, building on a remark of the Homeric scholia (Σ *Il.*2.783a), interpreted this appeal to hearsay as a distancing device (Eust.*Il.*347.8f. = I.544.6-7 VdV):

τὸ δέ **φασίν** εἶπε κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς ὁ ποιητής, ἵνα μὴ προσκρούοιμεν ὥς Ὀμηρικῶ ὄντι διὰ τὸ μυθῶδες.

The poet said '**they say**' in respect to the ancients, so that we do not disapprove of the passage in seeing it as a strictly Homeric tale, on account of its fabulous character.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Watkins (1995) 451-52; Lovell (2011) 18-20.

The Byzantine scholar constructs Homer in his own rationalistic image, distancing himself from an implausible, legendary myth. But as he further notes, **φασί** here acknowledges Homer's debt to his 'ancestors' (παλαιοί).<sup>63</sup> Like his hearsay-invoking characters, the narrator here gestures to pre-existing tradition. We should go further, however, and ask who the anonymous 'they' are who claim that Typhoeus' bed is among the Arimoi.

For scholars who regard Homer as engaging allusively with Near Eastern 'sources', one possible answer might be that **φασί** points to the poetic traditions of the Near East. Typhon appears to have a Semitic pedigree (compare the Canaanite-Phoenician name *šāpōn*) and Homer's placement of him here among the Arimoi (= Aramaeans?) has been thought to be a self-conscious acknowledgement of the myth's eastern origins.<sup>64</sup> However, as I argued in the introduction (§I.2.2: 36-38), we should be cautious of this approach which assumes an active and interpretable engagement with Near Eastern myth. Here in particular, the Aramean location appears to be a traditional feature engrained in the Greek tradition (cf. Hes.*Theog.*304; Pind.fr.93), and it is far more easily explained as the passive trace of a more distant literary genealogy, rather than a self-conscious cue to an earlier oriental tradition. It is unlikely that **φασί** would direct any audience member to Near Eastern myth, a 'source' which would also add little to our immediate appreciation of this simile.

Instead, a likelier answer to the significance of Homer's **φασί** lies in the Iliadic passage's similarity to Hesiod's description of Typhoeus' defeat in the *Theogony* (*Theog.*843-47, 857-59):

ἐπεστονάχιζε δὲ γαῖα.  
καῦμα δ' ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων κάτεχεν ἰοειδέα πόντον  
βροντῆς τε στεροπῆς τε πυρός τ' ἀπὸ τοῖο πελώρου  
πρηστήρων ἀνέμων τε κεραυνοῦ τε φλεγέθοντος·  
ἔξεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἡδὲ θάλασσα·  
...  
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ μιν δάμασεν πληγῇσιν ἰμάσσας,  
ῥριπε γυιωθεῖς, στενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Σ *Od.*6.42b, where Homer is similarly thought to 'indicate the tradition transmitted from his ancestors' (διὰ δὲ τοῦ φασί τὴν ἐκ προγόνων παράδοσιν ἐμφαίνει).

<sup>64</sup> Currie (2016) 201, 203-4. On the Arimoi: Fontenrose (1966).

φλὸξ δὲ κεραυνωθέντος ἀπέσσυτο τοῖο ἄνακτος

There are a number of significant parallels between these two passages.<sup>65</sup> In both accounts, Zeus lashes the ground (ἰμάσση, *Il.*2.782) or his foe (ἰμάσσας *Theog.*857), and the earth groans under the weight of these blows (γαῖα δ' ὑπεστενάχιζε, *Il.*2.781, στεναχίζετο γαῖα, *Il.*2.784) or the warring participants themselves (Typhoeus: στενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα, *Theog.*858, Zeus: ἐπεστονάχιζε δὲ γαῖα, *Theog.*843). In the wider context of both passages, emphasis is laid on Zeus' thunder as the weapon which vanquishes Typhoeus (Διὶ ὥς τερπικεραύνῳ, *Il.*2.781 ~ κεραυνοῦ, *Theog.*846; κεραυνόν, *Theog.*854; κεραυνωθέντος, *Theog.*859), and fire is a central element: the Iliadic fire simile which immediately precedes the description of Typhoeus (*Il.*2.780) matches the *Theogony's* similar emphasis on the fiery destruction of the physical environment during Zeus' clash with the monster (*Theog.*844-7, esp. πυρός, 845, χθὼν πᾶσα, 847 ~ πυρὶ χθὼν πᾶσα νέμοιτο, *Il.*2.780). Within a handful of Iliadic lines, there are thus numerous verbal connections with Hesiod's account of Typhoeus' defeat, connections which again reinforce the closural ring-composition of this simile: already before the Catalogue, the earth had thundered terribly beneath the Achaeans' feet (σμερδαλέον κονάβιζε, *Il.*2.466), just as it did in Hesiod's Typhonomachy (σμερδαλέον κονάβησε, *Theog.*840).

The relationship between Homer and Hesiod is, of course, a matter of much debate. Scholars ancient and modern have long debated the question of priority. Most today would take Homer to be prior, but a number of eminent scholars have argued for the opposite conclusion: that Hesiod precedes Homer.<sup>66</sup> If we accept this conclusion for the moment and consider a direct textual relation between the two possible, then we could see here a direct Iliadic allusion to Hesiod's *Theogony*, signposted through a footnoting **φασί**. Indeed, the *Iliad's* Typhoeus simile appears to offer a compact and miniature postscript to a major episode of Hesiod's poem, highlighting how the defeated Typhoeus continues to be punished in terms precisely comparable to his initial defeat (note the subjunctive ἰμάσση, indicating a recurring

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Nimis (1987) 75-77; Lovell (2011) 20-31; West (2011c) 214.

<sup>66</sup> Hesiodic priority: West (1966) 40-48, (2012); Burkert (1976); Blümer (2001) I.107-260. Contrast: Heubeck (1979) 109-16, (1982) 442-43; Janko (1982) esp. 94-98, 188-199, (2012).

action). As in the *Odyssey*'s possible reference to the Iliadic Nestor, Eustathius' phrase παραφράζων συντόμως captures the essence of this allusive strategy – Homer appears to invoke and epitomise a central episode of another poem.

We might be able to extend this conclusion further, however. The precise detail that Homer attributes to hearsay is that Typhoeus' resting place lies among the Arimoi, a detail which again finds close parallel in the *Theogony* (*Theog.*304-8):

ἡ δ' ἔρυτ' εἰν Ἀρίμοισιν ὑπὸ χθόνα λυγρὴ Ἑχιδνα,  
 ἀθάνατος νύμφη καὶ ἀγήραος ἥματα πάντα.  
 τῇ δὲ Τυφάονά **φασί** μιγήμεναι ἐν φιλότῃτι  
 δεινὸν θ' ὕβριστήν τ' ἄνομόν θ' ἑλικώπιδι κούρῃ  
 ἡ δ' ὑποκυσαμένη τέκετο κρατερόφρονα τέκνα.

Just as Homer places Typhoeus' bed 'among the Arimoi' (εἰν Ἀρίμοις, *Il.*2.783), Hesiod claims that Typhoeus slept with Echidna εἰν Ἀρίμοισιν. Here too, it would be attractive to see Homer allusively reshaping the Hesiodic narrative: as the ancient scholia note, Homer's εὐνάς is a euphemism: this was not his 'bed', but his 'tomb' (εὐφήμως δὲ τὸν τάφον εὐνάς ἐκάλεσεν, Σ 2.783a). Yet Homer's choice of language pointedly recalls the Hesiodic context in which Typhoeus did indeed sleep among the Arimoi: his final resting place matches his domestic place of rest in life. In doing this, however, Homer significantly departs from the Hesiodic conclusion, in which Typhoeus was dispatched to Tartarus (*Theog.*868). Homer's **φασί**, then, may not only signpost his allusive engagement, but also acknowledge competing versions of the myth. If so, this first Homeric instance of **φασί** would be very similar to the *dicuntur* that introduces Catullus' polemic sifting of Argonautic myth in *Carmen* 64.

What is particularly striking, however, is how Hesiod's own mention of Typhoeus' mingling with Echidna among the Arimoi is also indexed with a **φασί** – the sole use of the device in his whole poem (*Theog.*306). Given this shared use of the index in a similar context, we might even wonder whether it could hint at a reciprocal relationship between these two passages: if both poems were developing at a similar time, we might see a self-reflexive cycle of cross-referencing, in which each author knowingly nodded to the 'talk' of their poetic peer.



This, however, is a bit of a stretch, and as in the case of Nestor's age, so too here, it may again be more realistic to see both poets evoking a more general Typhoean and theogonic tradition, rather than a specific text. This is not only because of the uncertainties over the relative dates of our *Iliad* and *Theogony*, but also because Homer's account appears to reflect core features of the mythological tradition (or *fabula*) of Zeus' fight with Typhoeus that transcend Hesiod's specific telling: lashing, thunder, fire and the groaning earth. These elements are familiar to modern readers from Hesiod's poem, but they evidently pre-dated it. Watkins has argued that the lashing/binding motif is a very old element of the tradition, originally deriving from earlier Hittite versions of the tale,<sup>67</sup> and it certainly seems that the lashing motif was an integral part of the early Greek tradition too: in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Typhoeus' mother Hera similarly whips the earth before giving birth to the monster (ἵμασε χθόνα, *HhAp*.340). The key moments of Typhoeus' life (his birth and defeat) are both marked by the same violent act. In this regard, it does not matter if any of these motifs are common or 'typical' in epic individually. The 'groaning earth', for example, recurs elsewhere (*Il*.2.95, 10.484; *Hes.Theog*.159, 843, *Scut*.344), although never with precisely the same phrasing as here. But it is rather the combination of these motifs together in the same context which is distinctively and recognisably theogonic.

In both *Iliad* 2 and the *Theogony*, therefore, **φασί** signposts engagement with traditional theogonic narratives. In both cases, the index nods to the authority of tradition, marking each poet's encyclopaedic control of their poetic heritage. But in the case of *Iliad* 2, we can also detect a further agonistic edge, as Homer establishes his own narrative as both a peer and rival of theogonic myth. Through his simile, the pending conflict between the Greeks and Trojans becomes a replay of the cosmic struggle between Zeus and Typhoeus, between the defender of civilisation and the threat of chaos.<sup>68</sup> Homer signals his appropriation of theogonic myth, as he encapsulates it and subsumes it within a handful of verses. The mortal conflict of Greece and Troy is established as a fair match for the divine and primeval discord of the theogony. As

---

<sup>67</sup> Watkins (1995) 448-59.

<sup>68</sup> Though see Lovell (2011) 56-62 on the instability of this parallel – the Greek army can be aligned with both Zeus and Typhoeus.

with Antinous' allusion to female catalogue poetry, moreover, it is telling that this indexed allusion introduces a parallel which continues to underlie much of the whole poem: Titanomachic imagery recurs at various key points of the narrative.<sup>69</sup> Just like his characters, therefore, the Homeric narrator invokes hearsay to signpost his command of tradition.

#### II.2.4 The Epic Archive

As we have seen, Homeric appeals to hearsay in both the characters' and narrator's voice thus highlight the poet's mastery of his mythical repertoire, within which he selects and builds his own narrative, following some paths of song while pointedly suppressing others. These indexes tend to have an encyclopaedic or agonistic function: gesturing to the authoritative mass of tradition, or polemically challenging one aspect of it. Yet in both cases, Homer positions his own poem against the larger store of traditional tales from which he draws his material, gesturing to an archive of epic song.

Turning now to the broader epic tradition, we can see that both these aspects of indexical hearsay (the encyclopaedic and the agonistic) were in play. As an example of the former, we could cite a papyrus fragment (from Hesiod or the epic *Minyas*), which draws on the authority of tradition with a character's indexing **φασί** (*P.Ibscher* col.i; *Minyas* fr.7.12-22 *GEF* = fr.\*6 *EGEF* = Hes.fr.280.12-22).<sup>70</sup> After encountering Meleager in the Underworld, Theseus justifies his and Pirithous' *katabasis* by arguing that Pirithous is merely following the example of the gods in desiring to marry a relative: 'they say (**φασί**) that they [the gods] woo their sisters and make love without the knowledge of their dear parents' (ἐκείνους **φασί** κασιγνήτας με γ[. . .] . . εἰς[ μνησ]τεύειν, γαμέειν δὲ φίλων ἀπ' ἀν[ευθε] τοκῶν, vv.15-16). On one level, this index points to the traditional incest of the Olympian pantheon, an established feature of myth. But the phrase φίλων ἀπ' ἀν[ευθε] τοκῶν] may also invite us to

---

<sup>69</sup> Nimis (1987) 73-84.

<sup>70</sup> On the poem's ascription: Álvarez (2016) 48-51.

recall the most famous divine union of all, that of Zeus and Hera. In the Iliadic *Dios Apate*, Zeus is famously struck by a passion equal to that when he and his sister first furtively slept together ‘without their parents’ knowledge’ (φίλους λήθοντε τοκῆας, *Il.*14.296), a phrase that closely parallels the sense and structure of the papyrus in the very same metrical *sedes*. Some caution is required, given the fragmentary nature of the papyrus, and the frequency with which ‘parents’ (τοκῆες) are ‘dear’ (φίλοι) throughout early Greek poetry.<sup>71</sup> But if Pirithous were indeed modelling his behaviour on that of Zeus (either as a reference to the *Iliad*, or the *fabula* of the divine marriage), it would reinforce the brazenness (and ultimate futility) of his already hybristic mission: Meleager is right to shudder at what he hears (Οἰνεΐδης δὲ κατέστυγε μῦθον ἀκούσας, v.24).

A stronger case for a direct textual echo can be made for the sole instance of **φασί** in the *Works and Days*, a case that may parallel Telemachus’ potentially textual evocation of the Iliadic Nestor in the *Odyssey*. In the closing catalogue of ‘Days’, Hesiod claims that ‘on the fifth day, **they say** the Erinyes attended the birth of Oath, whom Eris bore as a plague to perjurers’ (ἐν πέμπτῃ γάρ **φασιν** Ἐρινύας ἀμφοπολεύειν | Ὀρκον γεινόμενον, τὸν Ἐρις τέκε πῆμ’ ἐπιόρκους, *Op.*803-4). We do not find the precise detail of the Erinyes attending Oath’s birth elsewhere, but this index attests to the traditional association that personified Oath (*Op.*219) and the Erinyes (*Il.*19.259-60, cf. 3.278-79) had with the punishment of perjurers, while also providing an aetiological explanation for the dangers that the fifth day of each month presented to those who were foresworn.<sup>72</sup> Most significantly, however, the detail of Oath’s birth looks back to its similar description in the *Theogony*, where the catalogue of Eris’ fourteen offspring reaches a climactic conclusion with Oath (*Theog.*231-32):<sup>73</sup>

<sup>71</sup> E.g. *Il.*4.477; Hes.*Theog.*469; Sapph.fr.16.10; Thgn.1.263; Aesch.*Eum.*271. The common formula strengthens the supplement τοκῆων, which is also plausible given the apparently formulaic nature of the clausula ἀπάνευθε τοκῆων (*Il.*24.211; *Od.*9.36).

<sup>72</sup> West (1978) 359. In addition, there may be some play with a dim tradition of the Erinyes as ‘attendants’: cf. *Od.*20.78, where the Harpies gave the daughters of Pandareus στυγερῇσιν Ἐρινύσιν ἀμφοπολεύειν – ‘to serve the hateful Erinyes’ or ‘for the hateful Erinyes to attend’? Cf. Rutherford (1992) 212-13.

<sup>73</sup> Thus West (1978) 360.

Ὅρκόν θ', ὅς δὴ πλεῖστον ἐπιχθονίους ἀνθρώπους  
πημαίνει, ὅτε κέν τις ἐκὼν ἐπίορκον ὁμόσση·

Besides the general thematic link, the *Works and Days* echoes this passage verbally, ἐπιόρκιος and πῆμ' picking up on the *Theogony's* πημαίνει and ἐπίορκον – a rare verbal combination which only appears once elsewhere in extant Greek literature: of the river Styx in the *Theogony*, the divine equivalent of Oath, who causes 'great woe' to any divinity who proves foresworn (μέγα πῆμα θεοῖσι. | ὅς κεν τὴν ἐπίορκον ἀπολλείψας ἐπομόσση | ἀθανάτων κτλ., *Theog.*792-94). Given the numerous close connections between the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* (§I.2.3: 49), it is very possible that here too we should see a specific cross-reference to Hesiod's earlier poem, drawing on its established authority. Of course, the *Theogony* did not specify the date of Oath's birth or the presence of the Erinyes, but its precedent nevertheless buttresses the addition of these new details. In gesturing to hearsay, Hesiod expands and develops a pre-existing strand of tradition.

A more agonistic case, meanwhile, is offered by the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, in which the eponymous god attributes Apollo's art of prophecy to tradition (*HhHerm.*4.471-72):<sup>74</sup>

σὲ δέ **φασι** δαήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς ὁμφῆς  
 μαντείας, Ἐκάεργε, Διὸς πάρα θέσφατα πάντα·

**They say** that you know the art of prophecy (that derives) from the utterance of Zeus, Far-Shooter, the complete revelation of Zeus' will.

Besides the irony that the newborn Hermes is already somehow immersed in the currents of hearsay, this phrase is a clear reference to the traditional association of Apollo with prophecy, an association already attested in the *Iliad* by his patronage of the prophet Calchas (*Il.*1.72). Beyond this general association, however, it is notable that Hermes' words here are repeated by Apollo later in the same poem (ὅσα φημὶ δαήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς ὁμφῆς. | μαντεῖν δὲ κτλ., *HhHerm.*532-33). The verbal repetition may suggest an independent formulaic phrase to which Hermes' earlier **φασί** could allude, but the repetition may also add a touch of humorous irony:

<sup>74</sup> For the punctuation of the Greek text, I follow Richardson (2010) 211. Contrast Vergados (2013) 533.

Hermes has prophetically pre-empted Apollo's own claim to prophecy. It is as if he has proleptically heard and quoted Apollo's sentiments, beating him at his own game of prophetic prediction. This agonistic one-upmanship would fit into the *Hymn's* larger intertextual engagement with the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, a 'sibling' hymn with which it has been seen to compete agonistically elsewhere.<sup>75</sup> In the Apolline poem, Apollo's oracular ability also played a central role: indeed, the god's opening words prophetically predicted his future occupation (χρήσω τ' ἀνθρώποισι Διὸς νημερτέα βουλήν, *HhAp*.132), a phrase that matches the sense, if not the vocabulary, of Hermes' sentiment. Hermes' appeal to hearsay in his own *Hymn* could thus point not only to Apollo's established role as an oracular deity, but also his particular establishment as such in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. By co-opting the prophetic voice himself, Hermes positions his own poem against that of a rival, just as Antinous' words in *Odyssey* 2 set Homer's poem against female catalogue poetry.

To close this chapter, however, let us turn to an example which appears to be doing something a little different to what we have seen so far: not simply invoking or contesting the authority of tradition, but openly reworking it. In the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, the disguised goddess of love fabricates a patently false genealogy during her seduction of Anchises, which she legitimises through appeal to hearsay (*HhAphr*.111-12):

Ὅτρεις δ' ἐστὶ πατὴρ ὀνομάκλυτος, εἴ που ἀκούεις,  
ὃς πάσης Φρυγίης εὐτειχέτοιο ἀνάσσει.

Aphrodite conceals her fabrications with the veneer of hearsay, appropriating the authority of tradition. Indeed, her language is very similar to that of Sinon in *Aeneid* 2, in a comparable context of disguised invention (εἴ που ἀκούεις ~ *si forte tuas pervenit ad auris*, *Aen*.2.81; ὀνομάκλυτος ~ *incluta fama gloria*, *Aen*.2.82-83: §I.1.2: 7). In context, this is a patent lie. Aphrodite is not the son of a mortal, but of Zeus, king of the gods, as the narrator has just reminded us (Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη, *HhAphr*.107). But her fictitious cover-story is not an outright invention. It rather builds on and adapts tradition. We know barely anything else

<sup>75</sup> *HhAp* and *HhHerm*: Richardson (2007) 89-92; Vergados (2013) 70-73; Thomas (2017) 77-80, esp. 79 on prophecy.

about Otreus, the man whom she co-opts as her father, but he is mentioned once elsewhere in archaic Greek literature, as one of two Phrygian rulers whom Priam assisted during an Amazon invasion (*Il.*3.186). In later sources, he was considered Priam's maternal grandfather (Apollod.*Bibl.*3.12.3) or Dymas' son, and so Hecuba's brother (*Σ Il.*3.189). He may thus belong to lost traditions of Trojan and Phrygian conflicts against the Amazons, perhaps part of the larger background of Penthesilea's involvement in the later stages of the Trojan war. But this alone hardly warrants his description as ὀνομάκλυτος.

As Olson has suggested, however, these references to hearsay may also index a more specific allusivity in Aphrodite's surrounding language, marking engagement with the *Iliad*. As he argues, Otreus' sole mention in the *Iliad* is during the *teichoscopia*, to which the hymnist's unique εὐτειχίτοιο ('well-walled') could nod. Similarly, the adjective used to describe Otreus in the *Hymn* (ὀνομάκλυτος) is a Homeric *hapax legomenon* that appears in *Iliad* 22, when Priam appeals to Hector, again from the vantage point of the Trojan walls (*Il.*22.51).<sup>76</sup> As Olson concludes, 'Aphrodite's lying tale – which leads directly to the birth of Aeneas, who escaped the destruction of Troy – thus engages pointedly with the story of the ruin of Priam and his branch of the royal family'.<sup>77</sup> Through a strong emphasis on hearsay, her audience are invited both to see through her fiction and to ask where they have heard these words before.

This is an attractive reading, but the intricate verbal precision may go a little too far. After all, although the adjective ὀνομάκλυτος is strictly a Homeric *hapax legomenon*, it does occur again in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (*HhHerm.*59), and – in divided form as a noun and adjective – twice in the *Odyssey* (ὄνομα κλυτόν, *Od.*9.364, 19.183).<sup>78</sup> A precise link to the Iliadic line thus seems implausible, especially given the absence of any real thematic connection. As for εὐτείχης, the adjective may be unique here, but the comparable εὐτείχεος occurs seven times in the *Iliad*, which suggests that describing something as 'well-walled' may carry a generic force, undermining a precise link with the Iliadic *teichoscopia*. Even so, however, the traditional resonance of the epithet may still lend a note of foreboding to Aphrodite's words:

<sup>76</sup> Olson (2012) 196-97.

<sup>77</sup> Olson (2012) 196.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. too ὀνομακλήδην (*Od.*4.278); later lyric appearances: Pind.*Pae.*6.fr.52f.123; Semon.fr.7.87; Ibyc.fr.306.1.

every Homeric instance of εὐτείχεος appears in the context of city-sacking, six times of Troy (*Il.*1.129, 2.113, 2.288, 5.716, 8.241, 9.20) and once of Briseis' hometown (*Il.*16.57).<sup>79</sup> When used of Phrygia in the *Hymn*, the epithet may thus look ahead to the future defeat of the Trojans and Phrygians in the coming war, even if not to the specific fate of Priam.

Once again, a character's emphasis on hearsay invites an audience to situate her words against the larger epic tradition. But in this case, the index plays a further role: marking and authorising the poet's openly creative reworking of tradition. In this regard, the hymnic poet appears to pre-empt an aspect of indexical hearsay which is more familiar in later literature: 'faux footnoting'. In the next chapter, we shall see how this aspect of the index is further developed in lyric poetry, especially Pindaric epinician.

Throughout early Greek epic, therefore, hearsay was already a well-established motif for the transmission and interaction of songs and stories. Characters' and narrators' appeals to what 'people say' and what their audiences have heard frequently signalled references to other traditions or even – on occasion – specific texts. These indexes variously flag a poet's encyclopaedic control of his material, an agonistic urge to compete and suppress alternative accounts, or even – on at least one occasion – the creative reworking of tradition. The various functions of the 'Alexandrian footnote' which we traced in the introduction are thus already deeply engrained in the allusive system of our earliest Greek poetry. From the very start, Greek poets could self-consciously index other traditions to carve out their space in the broader tradition. The 'Alexandrian footnote' could just as well be renamed the 'epic', 'Homeric', or 'poetic' footnote. It is not at all intrinsically tied to the scholarly interests and pedantic learning of the Alexandrian library.

---

<sup>79</sup> Cf. too Thgn.1210 (εὐτείχεα of Thebes, another city known for being sacked); Eur.*Andr.*1009 (εὐτειχῆς of Troy).

On Troy's Homeric epithets: Scully (1990) 69-80.

As we turn now to lyricists' use of indexical hearsay, we shall see that this allusive device remained an integral feature of early Greek intertextual practice throughout the archaic age.



## II.3 Lyric Fama

Just like their epic forebears, lyric poets display a strong interest in the circulation of news and stories. In the present, they are concerned with the preservation and memorialisation of their own subject matter, setting it on a par with the poetry of the past. Epinician poets, in particular, repeatedly stress the importance of the report of victory and the enduring fame it will provide for their *laudandi*, as well as their family and homelands. But they are far from alone in doing so: Theognis similarly claims that Cyrnus' fame will never die (Thgn.245-46), Sappho is concerned with the immortalising power of poetry (fr.55, fr.193), and Ibycus even promises Polycrates κλέος ἄφθιτον, that prized goal of epic heroes (S151.47, cf. *Il*.9.413). Lyricists are deeply committed to the propagation of renown.

In addition, however, lyricists are equally concerned with stories and myths of the past, which they commonly cite as exempla. Here too, these myths are regularly marked by the language of hearsay and rumour: *φασί, λόγος*, and similar forms occur frequently across the extant canon of early Greek lyric poetry, used occasionally in gnomic contexts but largely to introduce specific mythological tales.<sup>80</sup> As in epic, these appeals to tradition can be interpreted as having a strong indexical force, flagging engagement with and departure from the literary tradition. In contrast to epic, however, we can often make a stronger case for the indexing of precise sources, rather than the indexing of traditions in general.

In the sections that follow, we shall first explore how indexical hearsay performs the same functions as we have seen in epic: it may gesture to the authority of tradition (§II.3.1) or mark agonistic engagement with rival or suppressed narrative alternatives (§II.3.2). In addition, however, it also develops aspects which we saw only rarely in epic: inviting audiences to supplement a tale with their larger knowledge of tradition (§II.3.3) or legitimising a poet's creative reworking of their mythical inheritance (§II.3.4).

---

<sup>80</sup> *Gnomae*: *φαντί*, *Pyth*.4.287; *φαντί*, *Pyth*.7.19; *λέγεται*, *Nem*.6.56; *ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων*, *Nem*.9.6.

### II.3.1 Traditions and Texts

Like their epic peers, archaic lyricists frequently invoke hearsay when mentioning and narrating myths, imbuing their accounts with the authority of tradition. Due to our limited extant evidence and the fragmentary state of many of these poems, it is often difficult to situate cases of indexical hearsay within the larger traditions surrounding a given myth. But even from what we have, we can identify numerous plausible cases from at least the sixth century onwards.<sup>81</sup> We shall here explore the phenomenon in general, before turning to further nuances of its use in the following sections.

Sappho and Alcaeus present a number of early examples of indexical hearsay. In a small fragment of Sappho, for example, we find an indexed allusion to a tradition about Helen's birth (fr.166):

φαῖσι δὴ ποτα Λήδαν ὑακίνθινον  
... ὦιον εὖρην πεπυκάδμενον

The wider context of this fragment is lost, but what we have corresponds to the version of the myth in which Helen was not the daughter of Zeus (or Tyndareus) and Leda, but rather the product of a liaison between Zeus and Nemesis – born from an egg that Leda received from a wandering shepherd (Apollod.*Bibl.*3.10.7) or Hermes (Hyg.*Astr.*2.8).<sup>82</sup> The story was a popular

---

<sup>81</sup> Archilochus' Telephus elegy may offer an earlier example, but only if we accept Bowie's proposed reconstruction of the fragment: ἦ[ρῶ] ἐδεξάμεθ' ἄ[νδρ]α φυγεῖν (fr.17a.4: Bowie (2010b) 151 with 163n.22, (2016) 19-20 with n.12), indexing engagement with the myth of the 'Teuthranian Expedition', an episode familiar to us from the *Cypria* and elsewhere (Cypri.arg.7; §III.2.3: 150-153). However, few scholars accept Bowie's interpretation of the elegy as a self-standing narrative, since the fragment gives signs of being a paradigmatic *exemplum* that does not extend far beyond the surviving portion of text (Swift (forthcoming) *ad* fr.17a; cf. Lulli (2011) 100-4). A more dynamic first person verb is thus more likely, e.g. [εἴμ]εθ' ἄ[νδρ]α φυγεῖν (West (2006) 12-13).

<sup>82</sup> In Etruscan iconography, Hermes or one of the Dioscuri deliver the egg: Carpino (1996).

subject of fifth century vase painting and also featured in Cratinus' *Nemesis*,<sup>83</sup> but the tale was already well-established significantly before the fifth century: elements of the myth suggest a primal and even pre-Homeric pedigree,<sup>84</sup> and it certainly featured already in the cyclic *Cypria* (*Cypr.frr.10-11*).<sup>85</sup> Sappho's awareness of Cyclic epic is well-established from other fragments, including fr.17 on the Atreidai at Lesbos (~ *Od.3.168-75*, *Nostoi* arg.1; Burris et al. (2014)), fr.58 on Tithonus (§II.3.3: 109-115), fr.16 on the adultery of Helen (§III.3.2: 170n.132), and fr.44 on the marriage of Hector and Andromache (§II.3.3: 106-7). In such a climate of cyclic awareness, Sappho's **φαῖσι** thus signposts her introduction of a familiar epic episode, perhaps even nodding to a specific Cyclic source.

A comparable engagement with epic myth can also be found in Alcaeus, who similarly appeals to hearsay when discussing Priam's grief and the destruction of Troy 'because of Helen', (**ὥς λόγος**, fr.42.1), evoking a larger epic discourse surrounding her responsibility for the war.<sup>86</sup> Such a direct case of indexicality suggests we should expect something similar in two far more fragmentary Alcaean appeals to hearsay: the third poem in the first book of the poet's Alexandrian edition began by invoking tradition to authorise the Nymphs' creation from Zeus (**Νύμφαις ταῖς Δίος ἐξ αἰγιόχῳ φαῖσι τετυχμέναις**, fr.343 = S264.21-22 *SLG*). The poet nods to the familiar origins of the divine spirits, but we cannot now determine the larger context.<sup>87</sup> Even more obscure is another fragment which only preserves the poet's appeal to

<sup>83</sup> Vase painting: Chapouthier (1942). Cratinus' *Nemesis*: Bakola (2010) 168-73, 220-24.

<sup>84</sup> Kerényi (1939). If the myth predates the *Iliad*, there may be some irony in the Trojan elders' claim on the walls of Troy that there need be 'no nemesis' for the Greeks and Trojans to be fighting over Helen (**οὐ νέμεσις**, *Il.3.156*).

<sup>85</sup> West (2013) 63-65 dates the *Cypria* to the sixth century, but acknowledges the likely existence of 'a connected narrative – an epic, we should imagine – that covered more or less as much of the story as the *Cypria* did' by at least 'the last quarter of the seventh century' on the basis of a bronze tripod leg from Olympia preserving a series of episodes from the *Cypria* (cf. *id.* 42).

<sup>86</sup> Esp. **ἐκ σέθεν**, fr.42.3, **ἀμφ' Ἐλένῃ**, fr.42.15 ~ *Il.3.70*, 3.91; *Od.22.227*; Pind.*Pyth.11.33*; cf. Davies (1986c) 260n.15; Blondell (2010) 351-59; contrast Pallantza (2005) 28-34. For a parallel incipit: **Ἐλένην ποτὲ λόγος**, *P.Mich.3250c*: Borges – Sampson (2012) 27; Bernsdorff (2014) 6-7.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. *Il.6.420*; *Od.6.105*, 9.154, 13.356, 17.240; Hes.fr.304.5; Pherec.fr.16a.

tradition, without any further context (ὥς λόγος ἐκ πατέρων ὄρωρε, Alc.fr.339).<sup>88</sup> Even so, these examples suggest that Alcaeus – like Sappho – invoked hearsay at various points to authorise his myths and situate them against a larger tradition.

It is in the fifth century, however, that the device is particularly prominent – a fact that may suggest a gradual increase in its usage over time or simply reflect the better preservation of complete poems from this era. Pindar, in particular, is a fruitful source of the device; he is the most intense and frequent footnoter of tradition. In *Isthmian* 8, Zeus' assent to the marriage of Peleus and Thetis is signposted with **φαντί** (*Isth*.8.46a); the poet signals his engagement with the larger tradition of the pair's wedding and the threatening power of Thetis' offspring (§III.3.2: 169-70). In *Pythian* 3, Nestor and Sarpedon are singled out as '**the talk of men**' (ἀνθρώπων φάτις, *Pyth*.3.112), known to later generations from 'such echoing verses as wise craftsmen constructed' (*Pyth*.3.113-14); we are invited to recall the pair's prominent role in early Greek epic, perhaps especially in the *Iliad*.<sup>89</sup> And in *Olympian* 2, the poet similarly indexes Ino's immortal life among the Nereids (λέγοντι, *Ol*.2.28-30), an account which might look to the *Odyssey*'s specific description of her immortalisation and new life in the sea (*Od*.5.333-35: cf. Σ *Ol*.2.51d); but given her mentions elsewhere in archaic literature, we might suspect a more general nod to her mythical *fabula*.<sup>90</sup> Alongside his frequent indexing of non-Trojan myth,<sup>91</sup> it

<sup>88</sup> For similar frustrations surrounding limited context, cf. Xenophanes fr.7, which indexes an otherwise unknown fable: the poet moves on to '**another account**' (ἄλλον ἐπειμι λόγον) and reports a story about Pythagoras (fr.7a): '**they say**' (φασί) that a passerby '**once**' (ποτέ) took pity on a maltreated puppy, recognising the soul of a dear friend just from its voice. The satirical allusion to Pythagorean metempsychosis is obvious, but it is unclear whether this is an isolated invention of Xenophanes or part of a wider tradition of Pythagorean parody.

<sup>89</sup> Spelman (2018a) 106-9. Though see §I.2.1: 30-32 for the wider traditionality of Nestor. On the significance of the allusion: Sider (1991); A.M. Miller (1994).

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Hes.*Theog*.976; Hes.fr.70.1-7 (nursing of Dionysus: NB κλέος, fr.70.5, 7), fr. 91 (apotheosis?: Hirschberger (2004) 79); Alc.m.fr.50.

<sup>91</sup> E.g. Deucalion and Pyrrha (λέγοντι μάν, *Ol*.9.49: perhaps a reference to the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, Hes.frr.2-7, fr.234; D'Alessio (2005b) 220-28; Pavlou (2008) 555); Ixion's punishment (φαντί, *Pyth*.2.21); the deaths of Otus and Ephialtes (φαντί, *Pyth*.4.88); the Danaids (ἄκουσεν, ποτ', *Pyth*.9.112); Zeus' rape of Danae (φαμέν, *Pyth*.12.17); Zeus' fathering of Aeacus and Heracles (λέγοντι, *Nem*.7.84); Aeacus (κλεινὸς Αἰακοῦ

is thus clear that Pindar frequently marked his mythical allusions through the language of hearsay, authorising his account with the backing of tradition.<sup>92</sup>

Yet such appeals to hearsay are not restricted to the epinician genre in the fifth century. A similar indexical appeal to epic traditions is also visible in a pair of Attic *skolia* preserved by Athenaeus (15.695c = 898-899 PMG):

παῖ Τελαμῶνος, Αἴαν αἰχμητά, λέγουσί σε  
ἐς Τροίαν ἄριστον ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν μετ' Ἀχιλλέα

τὸν Τελαμῶνα πρῶτον, Αἴαντα δὲ δεύτερον  
ἐς Τροίαν λέγουσιν ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν καὶ Ἀχιλλέα.

The first focuses on the credentials of the Greek hero Ajax, gesturing to a well-established tradition of the hero as the second-best of the Achaeans. The sentiment recurs repeatedly in Homer and a variety of later authors, suggesting that it was a fixed part of Ajax's *fabula*.<sup>93</sup> Indeed, it is a crucial element of the hero's mythical biography, since it explains the great shame and anger he feels after he fails to beat Odysseus in the contest for Achilles' arms. The arms were a 'victory prize for the best' (τῷ ἀρίστῳ νικητήριον, Apollod.*Epit.*5.6). Based on the form of tradition, Ajax should have been their rightful heir. Aided by the indexical λέγουσι, these verses thus evoke an established element at the heart of Ajax's mythical *fabula*.

---

λόγος, *Isth.*9.1); Zeus' watching over Leto's birth pains (λέγο[ντι, *Pae.*12e.fr52m.9); Perseus' flight from the Gorgons (λέγοντι δὲ βροτοί, *Dith.*1.fr.70a.15); Cadmus' marriage of Harmonia (ποθ', [φ]άμα, *Dith.*2.fr.70b.27).

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Bacchylides: on Euenus' harsh treatment of his daughter Marpessa and his defeat by Idas (λέγουσι, fr.20a.14): cf. *Il.*9.555-64; Simon.fr.563; the chest of Kypselos (Paus.5.18.2); Bacchyl.20 (esp. χρυσάσπιδος υἱό[ν Ἀρηος], 20.11 ~ [Ἄρ]εος χρυσολόφου παῖ[δα], fr.20a.13-14). Also on Heracles' *katabasis* in pursuit of Cerberus (πι[οτ', λέγουσιν, Bacchyl.5.56-57): cf. *Il.*8.367-69; *Od.*11.623-26; Hes.*Theog.*310-12. Burnett (1985) 198n.7 notes other possible links with the *Minyad*, Stesichorus' *Cerberus* (fr.165a-b) and Cercops of Miletus' *Aegimius* (Robertson (1980)).

<sup>93</sup> *Il.*2.768-70; *Il.*17.279-80 = *Od.*11.550-1; *Od.*11.469-70 = *Od.*24.17-18; Alc.fr.387; Pind.*Nem.*7.27-30; Soph.*Aj.*1340-41. Cf. Ibyc.S151.32-34. At Troy, Achilles and Ajax were stationed at opposite ends of the Greek camp (*Il.*11.7-9), 'the best fighters securing the army's flank' (Heath – Okell (2007) 365). The pair are also frequently associated in art: Brommer (1973) 334-39, 373-77; Brunori (2011).

The second *skolion*, however, builds on and caps the first by imitating its allusive strategy while simultaneously shifting its point of comparison from heroic excellence to temporal priority. Ajax is now a peer of Achilles, but still in second place to his father, since Telamon beat him to Troy by a whole generation. The *skolion* thus picks up on and reworks the earlier poem's patronymic (παῖ Τελαμῶνος), as well as its concern with Ajax's status. Indeed, the hero is explicitly marked as **δεύτερος** here (in comparison to the first poem's ἄριστος), an adjective which may itself reflect this *skolion*'s secondary and epigonal status in relation to its predecessor.<sup>94</sup> Crucially, however, this poem clinches its argument through another appeal to hearsay, marking its allusion to another well-established element of Trojan myth: the tradition of Heracles' earlier expedition against Troy, in which Telamon played a key role.<sup>95</sup> Like its predecessor, this *skolion* thus alludes to an established feature of the Trojan war *fabula* and legitimises its claim with an indexing **λέγουσιν**. As a pair, they both invoke familiar features of tradition to justify their competing perspectives on Ajax. As generically 'low' sympotic song, they invoke the lustre of epic to authorise their own status as literature.

Besides nodding to the authority of tradition at large, however, the first *skolion* may also look back to a specific, famous instantiation of the Ajax-as-second-best motif. In *Odyssey* 11, when Odysseus encounters his adversary's shade, he not only recalls the arms contest (*Od.*11.544-49) and twice expresses the second-best motif (*Od.*11.469-70, 550-51), but also addresses the hero as παῖ Τελαμῶνος (*Od.*11.553), the same apostrophe that we find in the *skolion*. Indeed, this is a notably rare collocation that appears elsewhere only in Sophocles' *Ajax* (*Aj.*183) and an anonymous epigram in the *Palatine Anthology* (*AP* 9.116.3), both in the context of the arms contest and its aftermath.<sup>96</sup> Given the unique combination of the motif with this

<sup>94</sup> For this epigonal resonance of **δεύτερος**, cf. Torrance (2013) 194-97.

<sup>95</sup> Heracles' expedition: *Il.*5.638-42 (NB **φασί, ποτέ**); Hes.fr.43a.87-88, fr.165.10-14; Gantz (1996) 442-44. Telamon's involvement: Peisander fr.10 GEF; Pind.*Nem.*3.36-37, *Nem.*4.25, *Isth.*5.36-37, *Isth.*6.27-30; Soph.*Aj.*434-36; Eur.*Tr.*799-819.

<sup>96</sup> In Sophocles' drama, the phrase appears in the context of Ajax's frenzied revenge attempt on the Greek chieftains (with a potential echo of the *skolion* itself: G.S. Jones (2010)). In the epigram, Achilles' shield summons Ajax as its 'worthy bearer' (ἄξιον ἂσπιδιώτην).

rare vocative address, the *skolion* may thus look back to Odysseus' account of the Underworld encounter, an episode in which Ajax's status played an important role. Behind the vague λέγουσι, we may see a specific reference to Homer and Odysseus as the key authorities for this claim. Even in this case, however, we should be wary of overplaying the evidence, especially given the frequency with which Ajax is defined by his patronymic elsewhere in early Greek poetry (Τελαμωνιάδης, e.g. *Il.*9.623, *Od.*11.543, *Pind.Nem.*4.47; υἱὸς Τελαμῶνος, *Il.*13.177, 17.284, 17.293, *Pind.Nem.*8.23). The collocation παῖ Τελαμῶνος is ultimately not as distinctive as it first seems. Alongside the numerous other evocations of the second-best motif, and further echoes of epic phraseology in the *skolion* itself,<sup>97</sup> it is thus more plausible to see here an evocation of a more general motif of the epic tradition, rather than one specific instantiation. The *skolion* poet musters the support of tradition to prove his point, invoking a familiar and well-established feature of Ajax's mythical *fabula*.

So far, we have seen that lyric poets frequently indexed their mythical references by appealing to hearsay, signposting and authorising their engagement with other traditions (or perhaps even precise texts: the *Cypria*, *Iliad*, *Odyssey*). In two other cases, however, we can be very confident that an index points to a specific text even despite the appeal to anonymous hearsay. The most obvious of the two is a fragment of Simonides in which the mountain of Arete is introduced as a pre-existing tale (fr.579):<sup>98</sup>

ἔστί τις λόγος  
τὰν Ἀρετὰν ναίειν δυσαμβάτοισ' ἐπὶ πέτραις,  
τὴν δέ μιν θοαντὶ χῶρον ἀγνὸν ἀμφέπειν·  
οὐδὲ πάντων βλεφάροισι θνατῶν  
ἔσοπτος, ὃ μὴ δακέθυμος ἰδρῶς  
ἔνδοθεν μόλη,  
ἵκη τ' ἐς ἄκρον ἀνδρείας.

<sup>97</sup> Ajax is classed as an αἰχμητής in his Iliadic duel with Hector: ἄμφω δ' αἰχμητά, *Il.*7.281 (~ αἰχμητά, 898.1 PMG).

<sup>98</sup> On the fragment's possible context (an encomiastic poem?): Rawles (2018) 64-68.

As scholars have often remarked, these lines are a clear adaptation of a passage from Hesiod's *Works and Days* on the diverging paths of ἀρετή and κακότης (*Op.*286-92):

σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ ἐσθλὰ νοέων ἐρέω, μέγα νήπιε Πέρση.  
 τὴν μὲν τοι Κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἔστιν ἐλέσθαι  
 ῥηιδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναίει·  
 τῆς δ' Ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροισεν ἔθηκαν  
 ἀθάνατοι· μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτὴν  
 καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὴν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται,  
 ῥηιδίη δῆπναιτα πέλει, χαλεπή περ ἐοῦσα.

Simonides' evocation of this passage is secured by a number of verbal and thematic parallels: in Simonides' fragment, Arete dwells (ναίειν, fr.579.2 ~ ναίει, *Op.*288 of Κακότης) among rocks which are 'difficult to ascend' (δυσαμβάτοις, fr.579.2), just as the Hesiodic path to *arete* is 'long, steep and rough' (μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος ... | καὶ τρηχὺς, *Op.*290-91), while both passages also focus on reaching the pinnacle (εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται, *Op.*291 ~ ἵκει τ' ἐς ἄκρον 579.7), an endeavour which requires much sweat (ἰδρῶτα, *Op.*289 ~ ἰδρώς, 597.5). Although Simonides attributes this image to mere λόγος, there is thus a clear connection to the *Works and Days* passage, a connection which is further reinforced by the very personification of Arete: as Hunter notes, personification is a typically Hesiodic trope, through which Simonides here 'leaves little doubt stylistically as to which poet he is following.'<sup>99</sup> Behind its vague anonymity, the opening phrase ἐστὶ τις λόγος thus points not only to a familiar commonplace, but also to a specific literary predecessor.<sup>100</sup>

Of course, this is not to say that the index here introduces a verbatim quotation of Hesiod's λόγος in the *Works and Days*. Scholars have long noted Simonides' selective treatment of the Hesiodic passage.<sup>101</sup> For a start, the lyricist has elided all mention of Hesiod's κακότης and the smooth journey to it (*Op.*287-88, 292), instead focusing solely on ἀρετή.<sup>102</sup> But even

<sup>99</sup> Hunter (2014) 143.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Koning (2010) 147n.87; Hunter (2014) 142-43; Rawles (2018) 56-58.

<sup>101</sup> Esp. Babut (1975) 59-61.

<sup>102</sup> Koning (2010) 147; Canevaro (2015) 9.



here he transforms its significance: in Hesiod, ἀρετή stands largely for agricultural success and material prosperity – once it is achieved, one's path becomes easy. In Simonides, by contrast, ἀρετή has a more moral aspect, restricted exclusively to those who exhibit manly virtue (ἀνδρεία). Moreover, the struggle and sweat to achieve it has now become internalised and figurative (ἐνδοθεν), in comparison to the primarily physical labour envisioned by Hesiod, and there is now a perpetual difficulty and ongoing hardship even just to maintain virtue, unlike in Hesiod, where the path becomes easy as soon as ἀρετή has been achieved. As Babut remarks, Simonides has 'profoundly modified the structure and significance' of Hesiod's parable, rebranding it into a moral object lesson.<sup>103</sup> Simonides' opening appeal to hearsay, therefore, not only points to a precise literary predecessor, but also appropriates Hesiod's authority to legitimise his own new moral outlook. Simonides presents a pointedly appropriative intertextuality, signposted through the indexical introduction: **ἐστὶ τις λόγος**.

A similarly specific index occurs in Pindar's sixth *Pythian*, a poem which nominally celebrates a Pythian chariot victory by Xenocrates of Akragas, but which largely dwells on the filial piety of his son Thrasybulus. The youth, Pindar claims, upholds the precepts with which the centaur Cheiron once instructed the young Achilles (*Pyth*.6.19-27):

σύ τοι σχεθὼν νιν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ χειρός, ὀρθάν  
 ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν,  
 τὰ **ποτ'** ἐν οὔρεσι **φαντὶ** μεγαλοσθενεῖ  
 Φιλύρας υἱὸν ὀρφανίζομένῳ  
 Πηλεΐδᾳ παραινεῖν· μάλιστα μὲν Κρονίδαν,  
 βαρύναν στεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε πρύτανιν,  
 θεῶν σέβεσθαι·  
 ταύτας δὲ μή ποτε τιμᾶς  
 ἀμείρειν γονέων βίον πεπρωμένον.

---

<sup>103</sup> Babut (1975) 61: 'il en modifie profondément la structure et la signification', comparing his treatment of a saying of Pittacus: fr.542.

These instructions, to revere both the gods and one's parents, form a stock part of Greek moral didacticism.<sup>104</sup> But the scholia note a possible source for this maxim, 'the precepts of Cheiron' (αἱ Χείρωνος Ὑποθήκαι), a work attributed in antiquity to Hesiod (fr.283 = Σ *Pyth.*6.22):

τὰς δὲ Χείρωνος ὑποθήκας Ἡσιόδῳ ἀνατιθέασιν, ὧν ἡ ἀρχή·  
 εὖ νῦν μοι τάδ' ἕκαστα μετὰ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμησιν  
 φράζεσθαι· πρῶτον μὲν, ὅταν [εἰς σὸν] δόμον εἰσαφίκηαι,  
 ἔρδειν ἱερὰ καλὰ θεοῖς αἰειγενέτησιν.

Scholars have often taken this scholiastic note as evidence that the maxim in *Pyth.*6.23-27 derives directly from this Hesiodic poem,<sup>105</sup> although the scholia do not quite say as much: all they claim is that Hesiod was attributed a poem on the same topic. Yet it is a plausible inference that Pindar had this specific poem in mind. Both Pindar and Bacchylides appear to have alluded to the work elsewhere,<sup>106</sup> and the reverent and religious sensibility of the advice in *Pythian* 6 closely parallels the Hesiodic fragment's injunction to sacrifice to the gods. Alongside Pindar's description of the maxim as an ἐφημοσύνην, a term which Maslov suggests is 'equivalent to the genre term *hypothêke* "piece of didactic wisdom"',<sup>107</sup> there are thus strong grounds for seeing **φασί** directing Pindar's audience to a specific didactic predecessor. Given our near complete loss of the Χείρωνος Ὑποθήκαι, we cannot determine how Pindar manipulated his model, beyond his exploitation of Cheiron as an authorising figure of

<sup>104</sup> E.g. Hes.*Op.*331-32, 336-41; Aesch.*Eum.*269-71, 538-49; Eur.fr.853; Gorg.*Epitaph.*fr.6.4; Or.Sib.2.59-60. Cf. Dihle (1968); West (1978) 240; Kurke (1990) 89-90n.20.

<sup>105</sup> Kurke (1990) 90; West (2011b) 62; Pavlou (2012) 107; Spelman (2018a) 99. Lowrie (1992) 420n.21 even supposes that 'honour your parents' immediately followed fr.283's 'honour the gods' to match the sequence of thought in *Pythian* 6. Hutchinson (2001) 381 is more cautious.

<sup>106</sup> E.g. διδασκαλίαν Χείρωνος, *Pyth.*4.102 (Braswell (1988) 192-93); *Nem.*3.43-63 (D'Alessio (2005b) 232); τὰ δὲ Χείρωνος ἐντολαί, fr.177c; Bacchyl.27.34-38 (Merkelbach – West (1967) 143). Bacchylides' quotation of an otherwise unknown Hesiodic *gnome* (Bacchyl.5.191-94 = Hes.fr.dub.344) may derive from the Ὑποθήκαι (Maehler (2004) 128; Cingano (2009) 100), although it may instead paraphrase *Theog.*81-97 (Merkelbach – West (1967) 172). For other evidence of the poem's reception and popularity in the fifth century BCE: Kurke (1990).

<sup>107</sup> Maslov (2015) 265.

paraenetic authority.<sup>108</sup> But even from what remains, we can see that Pindar, like Simonides, indexed a precise citation through a vague appeal to hearsay.

In a host of lyric poems, therefore, indexical hearsay functioned as a way of marking allusion to other texts and traditions, appropriating their authority and signalling the poet's command of his or her sources. The phenomenon is very similar to what we saw in epic, but here we are often on far stronger ground when arguing for the precise citation of earlier texts. As Scodel once claimed for Pindar, 'What "they say" here may be what earlier canonical poetry said.'<sup>109</sup> But, as we have seen, this is not solely a Pindaric phenomenon. And if we had more texts surviving from antiquity, it is plausible that we could identify further precise references in many of the other cases we have explored. As things stand, however, we are simply no longer in a position to track their precise contours.

## II.3.2 Suppression and Contestation

In other lyric cases, we find more agonistic and polemical invocations of alternative or additional details of myth, a phenomenon we have already seen in epic with Homer's allusion to Achilles' immortality. In lyric poetry, too, we find instances where poets employ the language of hearsay to highlight their suppression of further details of a myth or their engagement with a particularly contestable point of tradition.

In Theognis' elegy on Atalanta, for example, the footnoting *φασίν* invites an audience to situate a specific telling of a myth within its wider mythological context (Thgn.2.1283-94):

ὦ παῖ, μή μ' ἀδίκηι - ἔτι σοι καταθύμιος εἶναι  
 βούλομαι - εὐφροσύνη τοῦτο συνεῖς ἀγαθῇ·  
 οὐ γάρ τοί με δόλῳ παρελεύσεαι οὐδ' ἀπατήσεις·

<sup>108</sup> Cf. *Pyth.*9.29-65, *Nem.*3.53-8; Halliwell (2009).

<sup>109</sup> Scodel (2001) 124.

νικήσας γὰρ ἔχεις τὸ πλεόν ἐξοπίσω,  
 ἀλλὰ σ' ἐγὼ τρώσω φεύγοντά με, ὥς **ποτέ φασιν**  
 Ἰασίου κούρην παρθένον Ἰασίην,  
 ὠραίην περ ἐοῦσαν, ἀναινομένην γάμον ἀνδρῶν  
 φεύγειν. ζωσαμένη δ' ἔργ' ἀτέλεστα τέλει,  
 πατρὸς νοσφισθεῖσα δόμων, ξανθὴ Ἀταλάντη·  
 ᾧχετο δ' ὑψηλὰς ἐς κορυφὰς ὀρέων,  
 φεύγουσ' ἰμερόεντα γάμον χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης  
 δῶρα· τέλος δ' ἔγνω καὶ μάλ' ἀναινομένη.

In these verses, the spurned speaker uses the exemplum of Atalanta to show that his addressee cannot run from him forever: just as Atalanta fled from marriage (γάμον... | φεύγειν, 1289-90; φεύγουσ'...γάμον, 1293), but eventually and unwillingly succumbed to its τέλος (1294), so too will the addressee, despite spurning love now (φεύγοντα, 1287), eventually feel the 'wound' of love (the speaker's τέλος).<sup>110</sup> Scholars have recently suggested that the introductory phrase ὥς **ποτέ φασιν** is 'a reference to poetic tradition'.<sup>111</sup> But more than that, I contend, it also encourages an audience to look beyond the bare details of Theognis' account to what the poet has left untold.

Ormand has noted that the opening verses of the poem, directed to the addressee, are larded with imagery relating to racing and competition: the boy will not pass the speaker by (παρελύσει, 1285 – a verb commonly used in agonistic contexts), the boy has been victorious (νικήσας, 1286), and the speaker will 'wound' his fleeing beloved (1287, evoking a scene of hunting or battle).<sup>112</sup> Given such preparatory clues, Theognis leads his audience to expect that

<sup>110</sup> Some suspect the unity of this poem and see the remnants of a sloppy join in 1288's 'extraordinary tautology' (West (1974) 166-67; Vetta (1980) 80-82), but Renehan (1983) 24-27 has convincingly refuted this view. In addition to his arguments in support of 1288, we could note the common apposition of παρθένος and κόρη in Greek poetry (Bacchyl. 16.20-1; Eur. *Tro.* 553-4, *Hel.* 168; Ar. *Thesm.* 1138-9; Autocrates fr. 1.2 K-A; Antiphanes fr. 122.9 K-A; Callim. fr. 782 Pf. etc.), itself part of a widespread Greek tendency to juxtapose *genus* and *species* (e.g. βούς...ταῦρος, *Il.* 2.480; Dodds (1960) 206; Renehan (1980) 348, (1985) 148). Those still unsatisfied may find inspiration for emendation in other full-verse descriptions of Atalanta: Callim. *hArt.* 216; ps.-Aristot. *Pepl.* 44.

<sup>111</sup> Ziogas (2013) 178. Roman poets indexed the myth similarly: *ferunt* (Catull. 2b.1); *forsitan audieris* (Ov. *Met.* 10.560). For the indexical significance of **ποτέ**: §IV: *passim*.

<sup>112</sup> Ormand (2013) 141-42.

the ensuing Atalanta exemplum will narrate the maiden's footrace against her suitors, known from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and several other later sources.<sup>113</sup> But this expectation is frustrated. Instead of the race, we are simply told that Atalanta retreated into the lonely mountains (1292).

This omission is particularly striking since in some versions of the tale (most probably including the *Catalogue*), Atalanta was said to have raced after her suitors fully armed, imitating a hunt, and killed them if she overtook them.<sup>114</sup> Such a narrative of violence would more appropriately parallel the speaker's desire to 'wound' his fleeing beloved here (σ' ἐγὼ τρώσω φεύγοντά με, 1287). Theognis' avoidance of this version is thus particularly pointed, all the more so since his ensuing narrative shares a number of phrases with the *Catalogue's* treatment of the episode, especially fr.73.4-5 and fr.76.6:<sup>115</sup>

πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ἀ]παναίνετο φύλον ὁμιλ[εῖν  
ἀνδρῶν ἐλπομένη φεύγ]ειν γάμον ἀλφιστάων[.

ἔετ' ἀναινομένη δῶρα [χουσῆς Ἀφροδίτης]

Just as in Theognis, so too in the *Catalogue*, Atalanta flees from marriage and the gifts of Aphrodite (~ Thgn.1289-90: ἀναινομένην γάμον ἀνδρῶν | φεύγειν; Thgn.1293-94 φεύγουσ' ἰμερόεντα γάμον, χουσῆς Ἀφροδίτης | δῶρα).<sup>116</sup> Admittedly, these parallels rely partly on reconstructions of the *Catalogue* that may be inspired by Theognis' verses. But these

<sup>113</sup> There is some confusion about the presence of two Atalantas in the mythological tradition: one Boeotian, the daughter of Schoineus and future wife of Hippomenes, involved in the footrace; the other Arcadian, the daughter of Iasius and future wife of Melanion, abandoned by her father and later a hunter: Gantz (1996) 335-39; Barringer (1996) 48-49; Fratantuono (2008) 346-52; Σ Eur.*Phoen.*150; Σ Theocr.3.40-42d. I follow Ormand (2013) 139 in seeing these doublets as deriving from an originally single mythical figure, sharing 'the significant attributes of aversion to marriage and swiftness of foot' and reflecting the same basic trope of a female paradoxically inhabiting a liminal, male, ephebic state (cf. Ormand (2014) 121-22; Detienne (1979) 30-32).

<sup>114</sup> Ormand (2014) 132-33. Cf. Apollod.*Bibl.*3.9.2; Hyg.*Fab.*185.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. West (1974) 16; Ziogas (2013) 177-78.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. too fr.76.10 δῶρα θε[ᾶς χουσῆς Ἀφροδίτης].

reconstructions are very plausible in their own right,<sup>117</sup> and even without any supplementation the fragments still exhibit a clear emphasis on marriage and its refusal. Indeed, φεύγειν γάμον appears to have been a formula particularly associated with Atalanta's *fabula*: besides its use in a general misogynistic *gnome* by Hesiod (*Theog.*603), it appears nowhere else in extant archaic literature, while Aristophanes' later use of the phrase for Atalanta's lover Melanion offers a playfully comic distortion of the same myth, as he – rather than Atalanta – runs in flight (*Lys.*781-96).<sup>118</sup> In Theognis' elegy, it is thus attractive to see the poet drawing on key vocabulary attached to the *fabula* of Atalanta's race, or even the *Catalogue*'s specific instantiation of it, reapplying this traditional phrasing to a different context: the mountains rather than the racetrack. Theognis thus pointedly elided the expected tale of the footrace, while still evoking it through the opening language of violent competition, as well as several verbal echoes of its traditional *fabula*. The introductory ποτέ φασιν, therefore, invites an audience to integrate this particular version of the tale within their wider knowledge of the myth, to appreciate the poet's subtle appropriation and refashioning of a conflicted tradition. It is not simply an authorising mark of tradition, but also a cue for the poet's audience to incorporate their broader knowledge of the myth and to consider the significance of what 'others say' about Atalanta, including – at least from our perspective – the poet of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*.

An even more knowing gesture to contestable tradition comes in Bacchylides' fifth epinician, a poem whose embedded myth of Heracles' katabatic encounter with Meleager is introduced – as we have already noted – with a footnoting λέγουσιν (Bacchyl.5.57: §II.3.1:

<sup>117</sup> ἀνδρῶν is highly likely in fr.73.5, since the adjective ἀλφειστής is always paired with ἀνήρ elsewhere in archaic epic (a combination also found in Attic tragedy: Aesch.*Sept.*770, Soph.*Phil.*708); the noun φῦλον is very frequently paired with a genitive plural noun, e.g. θεῶν, γυναικῶν and esp. ἀνθρώπων (e.g. *Il.*14.361, *Od.*15.409, *HhDem.*352, Hes.*Theog.*556, *Op.*90); and 'the gifts of (golden) Aphrodite' are a common epicism (*Il.*3.54, 3.64, *HhDem.*102, Hes.*Scut.*47, Hes.fr.195.47).

<sup>118</sup> Aristophanes' Melanion: Hawkins (2001) 143-47. Σ *Lys.*785a notes the motif transference: μήποτε παρὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν εἰρηκεν. οὐ γὰρ Μελανίων ἔφευγε μάλλον, ἀλλ' ἢ Ἀταλάντη.

93n.92). Over one hundred lines later, however, the narrative closes with an additional index, framing Bacchylides' whole account in an allusive ring composition and placing additional weight on the poet's final claim (Bacchyl.5.155-58):

φασὶν ἀδαισιβόαν  
 Ἀμφιτρύωνος παῖδα μοῦνον δὴ τότε  
 τέγξαι βλέφαρον, ταλαπενθέος  
 πότμον οἰκτίροντα φωτός·

Such an indexical frame may mark the general traditionality of this episode: after all, Heracles' katabatic encounter with Meleager was also narrated by Pindar (\*fr.249a, fr.dub.346(c)). But besides this, Bacchylides' φασὶν encourages an audience to recall other aspects of the myth besides those directly relayed here. In claiming that Heracles shed tears in his life 'then and only then' (μοῦνον δὴ τότε, 5.156), the poet appears to be protesting a little too much, and his indexical appeal to hearsay invites his audience to recall another later occasion on which Heracles was also said to cry: his death by the poisoned robe he had received from his wife Deianeira.<sup>119</sup>

In Sophocles' later tragic account of that myth, the hero's tears are a prominent motif: Heracles seeks pity for his pitiable self (οἰκτιρόν τέ με | πολλοῖσιν οἰκτιρόν, *Trach.*1070-71: contrast his pitying of Meleager in Bacchylides, οἰκτίροντα, Bacchyl.5.158) and claims that he has never cried before (καὶ τόδ' οὐδ' ἄν εἷς ποτε | τόνδ' ἄνδρα φαίη πρόσθ' ἰδεῖν δεδρακότα, | ἀλλ' ἀστένακτος αἰὲν εἰχόμεν κακοῖς, *Trach.*1072-74). Sophocles' treatment post-dates Bacchylides' *Ode*,<sup>120</sup> so it cannot be a specific intertext for his epinician, but it is plausible that similar sentiments would have been expressed already in one of the many earlier treatments of the Heracles myth, especially given the hero's broader tearless reputation in

<sup>119</sup> On the myth: March (1987) 49-77; Gantz (1996) 431-34, 457-60. Deianeira was an established part of tradition from at least the seventh century (Archil.frr.286-88).

<sup>120</sup> The dating of *Trachiniae* is uncertain, but it almost certainly post-dates Aeschylus' *Oresteia* (458 BCE: Easterling (1982) 19-23). In any case, Sophocles' first production was only in 468 BCE, considerably after the date of Bacchylides' poem (476 BCE: Cairns (2010) 75-76).

antiquity.<sup>121</sup> After all, in Bacchylides' own dithyrambic treatment of the hero's demise, Fate is said to 'weave a shrewd, tear-filled plan' for Deianeira, a phrase that suggestively alludes to the tears that result from her jealous attempts to regain Heracles' love (ἄμαχος δαίμων | Δαϊανείραι πολύδακρυν ὕφα[νε] | μήτιν ἐπίφρον', Bacchyl.16.23-25). And already in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, the narrative of Heracles' death (fr.25.20-25) closes with the hero going down to the 'much-lamenting house of Hades' (Ἄϊδ[αο] πολύστονον ἵκε]το δῶμα, fr.25.25), a phrase which – if we accept Merkelbach's plausible supplement – may not only evoke the generic doom and despair of the Underworld, but also the specific tears and lamentation of Heracles' end, a contrast to his previously ἀστένακτος existence.<sup>122</sup>

It is likely, therefore, that Heracles would have traditionally broken his tearless reputation only at the very end of his life, rather than in one chance encounter with a deceased hero in the middle of his labours. By importing the motif into Heracles' *katabasis* (an adventure that itself imitates the end of life), Bacchylides is thus self-consciously innovating, introducing an ominous allusion to the hero's future fate by means of 'motif transference'.<sup>123</sup> For a knowing audience, Bacchylides' claim that this was the only occasion on which Heracles cried would be transparently untraditional and open to question. The claim is supposed to be challenged, and **φασί**ν marks it as such: 'who else has said this?' we are invited to ask. The answer? 'Nobody.' Just as in Agenor's Iliadic evocation of Achilles' mortality, therefore, the indexical **φασί**ν highlights a point of tradition at the point where it is most contestable.<sup>124</sup>

An audience member who makes such a connection with Heracles' future death, moreover, would find great irony in the fact that this underworld encounter with Meleager is

<sup>121</sup> E.g. Soph.*Trach.*1199-1201; Theoc.*Id.*24.31.

<sup>122</sup> Merkelbach's supplement is extremely plausible: cf. Soph.*OT.*29-30 for Hades' association with lamentation. πολύστονος is not used of the 'house of Hades' elsewhere, but other attested adjectives do not fit the remaining space: εὐρυπυλές (*Il.*23.74; *Od.*11.571), μέλαν (Thgn.1014), μέγα (Thgn.1124).

<sup>123</sup> Motif transference: §I.2: 24; Burgess (2006). Currie (2016) 129 also suspects Bacchylidean invention.

<sup>124</sup> Later authors continue to adapt the 'first tears' motif: cf. Maehler (2004) 125. Notably, Euripides playfully inverts Sophoclean temporality in *Heracles Furens*: the hero weeps after slaughtering his children (*HF.*1353-56), 'earlier' in literary time, but 'later' from the perspective of literary history (Suter (2009) 67).



also the very moment that precipitates Heracles' future tears. It is in this meeting that the Theban hero first hears of his future wife Deianeira, Meleager's sister (Δαϊάνειραν, 5.173). The closing reference to Deianeira as 'still without experience of golden Cypris, that enchantress of men' (νήϊν ἔτι χρυσέας | Κύπριδος θελξιμβρότου, 5.174-75) is especially pointed, since Deianeira will kill Heracles precisely when she resorts to magic and θέλξις in an attempt to regain his love, the domain of Cyprian Aphrodite.<sup>125</sup> Bacchylides' **φασί**ν is thus extremely loaded, inviting his audience to challenge his assertion and recall another occasion on which Heracles was traditionally thought to have cried. Indeed, Heracles' Underworld tears proleptically foreshadow those which are still to come.<sup>126</sup> Ultimately, Heracles' fate is not very dissimilar from Meleager's own and Heracles is not far from the truth when he suspects that he will be killed by Meleager's murderer (Bacchyl.5.89-91). Their murderers are not the same, but still very similar: close female relatives, Deianeira and δαΐφρων Althaea (Bacchyl.5.137).<sup>127</sup> Both heroes thus prove to be archetypal embodiments of the maxim which introduced Bacchylides' extended narrative: 'no man is fortunate in all things' (οὐ | γάρ [ο τις] ἐπιχθονίων | π[άντ]α γ' εὐδαίμων ἔφω, 5.53-55). Far from simply highlighting the traditionality of Bacchylides' account, therefore, this concluding index encourages an audience to situate this specific version within their wider knowledge of the myth, emphasising the contestability of tradition and looking forward to Heracles' traditional tears that are still to come.

As in Theognis, therefore, Bacchylides' use of indexical hearsay has a pointedly agonistic edge. The index encourages an audience to set rival and competing alternatives against each other. Theognis relocates Atalanta's asceticism from the racecourse to the

<sup>125</sup> Thus Campbell (1982) 432, comparing the θελκτικήα of Aphrodite's girdle (*Il.*14.215). Cf. Lefkowitz (1969) 86-87; Cairns (2010) 243-44; Willigers (2017) 116-17. Some also see a further positive allusion to Heracles' subsequent apotheosis: Goldhill (1983) 78n.31; Stenger (2004) 154-57.

<sup>126</sup> Burnett (1985) 146; Currie (2016) 129.

<sup>127</sup> Acoustic echo between Deianeira's name (man-destroyer) and the epithet of 'Meleager's murderous mother': Lefkowitz (1969) 86; cf. δαΐφρων of Artemis (Bacchyl.5.122), another destructive female in the poem. The epithet may also evoke the firebrand of the Meleager myth: Cairns (2010) 89.

mountains, and Bacchylides invites his audience to challenge the assertion that Heracles cried only in his meeting with Meleager, rather than at the traditional moment of his death. As in epic, therefore, so too in lyric, indexical appeals to hearsay frequently emphasise the flexibility and fierce contestability of the mythical tradition.

### II.3.3 The Poetics of Supplementation

These last examples, those of Theognis and Bacchylides, also exhibit an aspect of indexical hearsay that is considerably widespread in lyric – indexes which invite an audience to supplement the immediate narrative at hand with their larger knowledge of tradition. Just as Bacchylides invites audiences to recall Heracles' future demise at the hands of Deianeira, so too do other lyricists frequently prompt an audience to supplement their sparse telling of a myth with further details. Such an invitation to 'fill in the gaps' was less common in epic. It presumably stems from lyric poetry's briefer and more self-contained treatment of myth, with very few extensive narrations. Within lyricists' selective treatments of a story, indexical appeals to hearsay evoke other untold details, complicating, ironising and enriching the present telling.

A familiar case of such signposted supplementation is Sappho fr.44, an epicising fragment on the wedding of Hector and Andromache. When the Trojan herald Idaeus predicts future κλέος ἄφθιτον ('undying fame') as a result of the marriage (fr.44.2-4), the audience are invited to supplement Sappho's selective treatment of the myth with their wider knowledge of the couple's famous but unhappy future: Hector's death, Andromache's enslavement, and their son's brutal murder.<sup>128</sup> Even at this joyous moment of marriage, Sappho's invocation of

---

<sup>128</sup> Similarly, Spelman (2017) 753. The phrase also acknowledges Sappho's role in preserving this κλέος (Budermann (2018) 141) and may look back to the Iliadic Hector's hope for future κλέος (Il.7.86-91: Xian (forthcoming)). Cf. ὕμνην in the final verse (fr.44.34), a self-reflexive nod to the songs produced about the couple. Other lyric instances of κλέος and its compounds similarly index tradition: Stesichorus' *Sack of Troy*

κλέος invites her audience to incorporate their awareness of the *Iliad* or the larger Trojan war tradition, looking forward to the very end of the pair's marriage, just as Homer, at Hector's death, looks back to its very start (*Il.*22.466-72).<sup>129</sup>

A comparable and less well-known invitation to 'fill in the gaps' occurs in a short fragment of Ibycus, whose context is now lost (Ibyc.fr.303):

γλαυκώπιδα Κασσάνδραν  
ἐρασιπλόκαμον Πριάμοιο κόραν  
φᾶμις ἔχησι βροτῶν.

Cassandra is here presented as a traditional figure of myth, within the grip of *fama* itself, as indeed she was: besides her appearances in epic, she featured in Alcaeus, Bacchylides, Pindar, as well as frequently in archaic art.<sup>130</sup> In Ibycus' Polycrates Ode, she appears again as the subject of song (τανί[σφ]υρ[ον] | ὕμ]νῃν Κασσάνδραν, S151.11-12) in a poem that similarly emphasises the traditionality of the Trojan war myth, 'the **much-sung** strife' (δη]ριον πολύμνον, S151.6) around the '**most renowned**' city of Troy (περικλέες, S151.2). The short Ibycan fragment in question here, however, lacks a clear context. Given its fragmentary state, we do not know what (if anything) came before or after it. Even so, the extant verses exhibit a strong epic flavour, akin to Sappho fr.44 with their epic-style compound adjectives and -οιο genitive ending. As in Sappho's fragment, we might thus be encouraged to think of this φᾶμις as taking a specifically epic form.

But more than this, given the traditional resonance of the fragment's epithets, the indexical φᾶμις may also point to a specific moment in Cassandra's mythical biography. The adjective γλαυκῶπις is a notably unusual choice for Cassandra: besides its appearance here, it

---

(κλέος, fr.100.14; [ἀ]νθρώπους κλέος[ς], fr.117.9; [Τ]ροίης κλεεννό[ν], fr.117.6); Simon.fr.eleg.11.13-15 (ἀοίδιμον, κλέος, cf. ἀγλαόφη[με], fr.eleg.10.5); Ibyc.S151 (see below).

<sup>129</sup> Kakridis (1966); Rissman (1983) 119-41; Meyerhoff (1984) 118-39; Schrenk (1994); Pallantza (2005) 79-88. Even if one is wary of accepting specific allusions to the *Iliad* here (e.g. Kelly (2015a) 28-29), the traditional *fabula* of the couple's impending fate will still hover in the background.

<sup>130</sup> Cassandra: *Il.*13.365-66, 24.699-706; *Od.*11.421-23; *Cypr.*arg.1d; Alc.fr.289; Bacchyl.23; Pind.*Pyth.*11.33, *Pae.*8a.fr.52i(A); LIMC s.v. 'Aias II'.

is only ever used of Athena in archaic epic and lyric. Indeed, it is a stock epithet of the goddess, used over ninety times of her in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alone.<sup>131</sup> Given its traditional association, Ibycus' innovative redeployment of the epithet for Cassandra suggests a close association between the goddess and the Trojan princess. As Wilkinson has suggested, the resulting link may parallel the beauty of both figures (for Cassandra's beauty, see *Il.*13.366), but it also evokes the story of Cassandra's rape by Locrian Ajax, an episode in which Athena played a central role: not only did the rape take place in her temple at Troy, violating the goddess' cult statue, but Athena was also the one to punish Ajax with death at sea and the rest of the Greeks with a stormy *nostos*.<sup>132</sup> Through the unusual adjective, Ibycus thus gestures to this specific aspect of Cassandra's mythical *fabula*, supported by the indexical force of *φᾶμις*.

The allusion is reinforced further, however, by the other adjective used to describe Cassandra in these verses, *ἐρασιπλόκαμος* ('lovely-locked'). This is a very rare epithet, used elsewhere in extant Greek literature before late antiquity only twice of other mythical rape victims: of Tyro, who was raped by Poseidon (Τυροῦς ἐρασιπλοκάμου γενεά, *Pyth.*4.136; cf. 4.138 Παῖ Ποσειδᾶνος), and of the Muse Calliope, who bore Orpheus after being ravished by Oeagrus or Apollo (Μούσας ἐρασιπ[λοκάμου, *Bacchyl.*28.9-11).<sup>133</sup> It thus appears to have been an epithet especially suited to victims of male sexual violence. Its use here would further encourage the recall of Cassandra as Ajax's victim, just as *γλαυκῶπις* evokes Cassandra as a favourite of Athena.<sup>134</sup> Given these hints, it would be unsurprising if these Ibycan verses were originally followed by a narrative account of the rape, similar to that we find in Alcaeus fr.298; the allusive hints in Ibycus' language would then set the course for the ensuing narrative. But even if the original poem contained nothing more than a passing reference to Cassandra, its vocabulary, alongside the indexical *φᾶμις*, would still point to a specific moment in the

<sup>131</sup> *Iliad* (36x), *Odyssey* (57x), *Homeric Hymns* (7x), Hesiod (12x); cf. Tyrt.fr.2.16; Stesich.fr.18.3; Peisander fr.7.1 GEF; Pind.*Ol.*7.51, *Nem.*7.96, 10.7, *Dith.*fr.70d.38.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. Wilkinson (2013) 277. Cf. *Il.Pers.*arg.3; Alc.fr.298. Art: Gantz (1996) 655.

<sup>133</sup> Tyro: *§II.2.2*: 71 with n.43. Calliope: Prop.2.30b.35-36; Fedeli (2005) 865-66.

<sup>134</sup> For the allusive potential of Ibycus' epithets elsewhere: Barron (1969) 133-34; Steiner (2005).

heroine's *fabula*. Ibycus' allusive index thus invites an audience to look beyond (and through) his immediate words to harness the larger, unexpressed tradition that lies beyond them.

As a final example, we may turn to a particularly rich instance of such signposted supplementation: the recently reconstituted Sapphic poem on Tithonus and old age. In this poem, the poet's persona laments her ageing physique before ending with a mythical exemplum that proves mortals' inability to escape senile decrepitude (Sapph.fr.58.8-12):<sup>135</sup>

ἀγήραον ἄνθρωπον ἔοντ' οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι.  
καὶ γὰρ **π[ο]τα** Τίθωνον **ἔφαντο** βροδόπαχυν Αὔων  
ἔρω δεδάθεισαν βάμεν' εἰς ἔσχατα γᾶς φέροισα[ν,  
ἔοντα [κ]άλογον καὶ νέον, ἀλλ' αὐτον ὕμῳς ἔμαρψε  
χρόνῳ πόλιον γῆρας, ἔχ[ο]ντ' ἀθανάταν ἄκοιτιν.

Tithonus, the mortal husband of Dawn, is introduced to prove that even those intimately connected with the gods cannot escape old age: γῆρας still seized him, just as it did frail Laertes in the *Odyssey* (κατὰ γῆρας ἔμαρψεν, *Od.*24.390, cf. fr.58.11-12). At the outset, this tale is indexically marked as the subject of hearsay, a familiar part of tradition (**ἔφαντο**, fr.58.9). And indeed, Tithonus was a familiar mythical character from Homer onwards: in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, he is already the spouse of Dawn, lying in her bed as she rises to inaugurate the day (*Il.*11.1-2, *Od.*5.1-2), while in Hesiod, he and Dawn are named as the parents of Memnon and Emathion (*Theog.*984-85). He may also, moreover, have made an appearance in the *Aethiopis* and its associated traditions, in which his son Memnon also receives immortality thanks to the intervention of Dawn (*Aeth.arg.*2e).<sup>136</sup> However, it is only a little later that we first encounter clear evidence for the tradition of his flawed immortality, as evoked here by Sappho: he was granted exemption from death, but he could not stop the process of ageing and gradually withered away. In addition to Sappho fr.58, this tradition of Tithonus' unavoidable

<sup>135</sup> The text was first published by Gronewald – Daniel (2004a), (2004b) and has since received a flurry of scholarly attention. See esp. West (2005a); Budelmann (2018) 146-52. Here, I follow the text of Janko (2017), especially for v. 10 δεδάθεισαν (cf. Budelmann (2018) 151-52 on the textual crux).

<sup>136</sup> Brown (2011) 24 with n.17. In their immortality, father and son form a narrative doublet, a common feature of early Greek epic: Sammons (2013), (2017) 101-125.

ageing appears in the work of Sappho's contemporary Mimnermus (fr.4: Janko (1990)), as well as more extensively in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, when the goddess introduces Tithonus' plight as an exemplum for Anchises of the dangers of divine-mortal relations (*HhAphr.*218-38).<sup>137</sup> Sappho's ἔφαντο thus points to a well-established tradition of Tithonus as Dawn's spouse and a figure of perpetual ageing.<sup>138</sup> Indeed, it may even point to our *Homeric Hymn* as a privileged intertext.<sup>139</sup>

Besides invoking a specific tradition or text, however, Sappho's ἔφαντο may also prompt her audience to recollect an aspect of the myth about which others have previously 'talked', but which she leaves unmentioned here: Tithonus' subsequent transformation into a cicada. The Trojan prince wasted away to such an extent that he eventually became a tiny insect that feeds only on dew, left with nothing more than his own beautiful voice – an *action* to explain the fact that cicadas start chirping around dawn. The earliest explicit mention of this metamorphosis comes from Hellanicus of Lesbos in the fifth-century – notably, a compatriot of Sappho, perhaps suggesting a particularly Lesbian or Aeolic interest in this myth (*FGrHist* 4 F140 = fr.140 EGM).<sup>140</sup> Yet earlier texts already hint at this tradition, especially the *Homeric Hymn*: as Kakridis has argued, the description of Tithonus' ceaselessly flowing voice matches the constant chirping of the cicada (φωνὴ ῥεῖ ἄσπετος, *HhAphr.*237), and he is locked away in the θάλαμος like a cicada in a basket (*HhAphr.*236).<sup>141</sup> More significantly, Janko notes that the description of 'shedding old age' (ξῦσαι τ' ἄπο γῆρας, *HhAphr.*223) evokes the tradition of cicadas shedding their skin, playing on the polyvalent potential of γῆρας to mean

<sup>137</sup> Tithonus also appears in Tyrtaeus as an example of great beauty (fr.12.5); there is no mention of his aged wasting, but if an audience recalled it, it would add a poignant note, acknowledging the transitory nature of this beauty.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. Hardie (2005) 28; Rawles (2006) 3. For other nuances: Janko (2017) 275-76.

<sup>139</sup> Rawles (2006) 1-4; de Jong (2010) 156-60. Note ἐπὶ πείρασι γαίης (*HhAphr.*227) ~ εἰς ἔσχατα γᾶς (fr.58.10); ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως (*HhAphr.*214) ~ ἀγήραον (fr.58.8), ἀθανάταν (fr.58.12). Faulkner (2008) 270 lists further verbal parallels but suspects a 'common model'. Sapph.fr.44 may also show awareness of the *Hymn*: Janko (1982) 169-70; Faulkner (2008) 45-47.

<sup>140</sup> Cf. Janko (2017) 285-86.

<sup>141</sup> Kakridis (1930a); cf. West (2003a) 177. Faulkner (2008) 276 and Carrara (2011) 103-9 remain sceptical.

both ‘old age’ and ‘exuvia’,<sup>142</sup> while Rawles has suggested that the rare noun κῆκυς (‘strength’, *HhAphr.*237) puns on the ‘kik’ sound of the insect (a sound also reflected in the insect’s Latin name, *cicada*, and in Greek vocabulary: Hsch. s.v. κίκους).<sup>143</sup>

Despite no explicit mention, therefore, the hymnic poet leaves a number of traces that hint at the cicada metamorphosis, suggesting that this feature of the myth may have also been in the background of Sappho’s fragment.<sup>144</sup> Indeed, the metamorphic myth could even be traced back to the *Iliad*, with its famous comparison of Trojan elders to cicadas (*Il.*3.149-53): just like their relative Tithonus, these aged men are worn down by old age (γήραϊ), and though no longer fit for battle, they remain good speakers (ἀγορηταὶ ἐσθλοί).<sup>145</sup> The simile encapsulates the core elements of Tithonus’ transformation: the physical decay of the body, but the enduring power of the voice. It is thus certainly possible that this metamorphosis already formed an established part of the literary tradition with which Sappho worked. And indeed, King has argued that another Sapphic fragment may even allude to the myth directly.<sup>146</sup> We could thus interpret ἔφαντο here as another act of signposted supplementation, prompting an audience to consider the larger tradition of the story with which they were familiar. As Rawles notes, such a reference would certainly resonate against the poem’s larger concerns, adding a note of consolation to the dreary inevitability of old age. The insect’s enduring voice parallels the poetess’ immortal song: although Sappho’s body cannot conquer death, her poetry certainly can.<sup>147</sup>

Sappho’s ἔφαντο, like her κλέος in fr.44, thus gestures to larger Trojan traditions: Tithonus’ marriage to the immortal Dawn, his own inescapable ageing and his eventual transformation into a cicada. In our discussion so far, however, we have avoided commenting on one feature of Sappho’s ‘footnote’ that has caused a great deal of scholarly consternation:

---

<sup>142</sup> Janko (2017) 288; cf. Brown (2014).

<sup>143</sup> Rawles (2006) 6.

<sup>144</sup> The overall muting of the metamorphosis fits Aphrodite’s rhetorical strategy in the *Hymn*: King (1986) 27-30.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. Σ(D) *Il.*3.151; Janko (2017) 286.

<sup>146</sup> King (1986) 27n.22; Sappho fr.21.5, χροά γῆρα ἤδη (cf. fr.58.3).

<sup>147</sup> Cf. Rawles (2006) 6-7; Janko (2017) 288-89.

its unusual past tense. Instead of the usual φασί, we find the imperfect middle ἔφαντο, a form elsewhere found predominantly in epic.<sup>148</sup> There have been many attempts to explain the apparent anomaly,<sup>149</sup> but one particularly intriguing suggestion is that of Bettarini, who has argued that the verb's tense establishes a contrast between two different versions of the Tithonus myth, one old and outdated, the other new and current.<sup>150</sup> According to his argument, Sappho's predecessors 'used to say' that Tithonus became immortal *and* ageless, remaining both young and beautiful (κ]άλοιν καὶ νέον), with no negative complications. Such a tradition, he argues, is reflected in Homer's dawn periphrases (*Il.*11.1-2, *Od.*5.1-2), where Eos is pictured rising from the side of Tithonus, a detail that others too have taken to imply that – in Homer at least – 'he was immortal and ageless like her'.<sup>151</sup> In Sappho's day, by contrast, following Bettarini's argument, Tithonus is said to be immortal *but* still ageing: in this newer and still current version, even he could not escape the onset of γῆρας. For Bettarini, Sappho's ἔφαντο thus points to a former tradition that is no longer active, contrasting it with the more recent and complicated instantiation of the myth with which she is concerned. If true, Sappho's index here would not only point to other texts and traditions, but also exhibit an intense literary historical awareness, reflecting on the diachronic development of a specific myth.

Some support for this reading may be found in Pindar, who elsewhere similarly distinguishes different versions of a single myth. Brown compares Pindar's first *Olympian*, where the envious gossip of Pelops' neighbour (also expressed with the imperfect: ἔννεπε, *Ol.*1.47) is set against Pindar's more 'recent' version of the myth (*Ol.*1.35-52, §IV.3.2: 219-20).<sup>152</sup> An even closer parallel, however, can be found in Pindar's first *Nemean*, where the poet claims

<sup>148</sup> *Il.*6.501, 12.106, 12.125, 17.379; *Od.*4.638, 13.211; *Hh.*7.11.

<sup>149</sup> Edmunds (2006) 24 sees a contrast between what Sappho used to hear and think about old age, and what she understands now; Lardinois (2009) 47 sees a hint that the story dates back to a time before Sappho's addresses were born.

<sup>150</sup> Bettarini (2007) 1-5. Cf. Brown (2011) 22: 'the imperfect seems to suggest something that is no longer true, although once asserted', although he goes on to see this contrast in the mythical world of the story, rather than as a fact of literary history.

<sup>151</sup> Janko (2017) 280; cf. Meyerhoff (1984) 190; Bettarini (2007) 2-4; Brown (2011) 24; Carrara (2011) 92-93.

<sup>152</sup> Brown (2011) 25.



that he is rousing up an ‘old tale’ (ἀρχαῖον ὁτρύνων λόγον, *Nem.*1.34). This appears to contrast his traditional account of Heracles’ infancy (possibly derived from Peisander’s epic *Heraclea*)<sup>153</sup> with a more recent version, perhaps Pherecydes’ near-contemporary rationalisation of the myth (in which Amphitryon, not Hera, sent the snakes: fr.69a-b).<sup>154</sup> If Pindar could draw such a distinction between different versions of the same myth, we may indeed wonder whether Sappho could do the same a century earlier.

However, I am sceptical whether ἔφαντο alone can mark the differentiation that Bettarini requires of it. Admittedly, his argument appears to be supported by the syntax of these verses: only the claim that Eos ‘went’ to the ends of the earth with Tithonus is strictly part of the indirect speech introduced by ἔφαντο, whereas the onset of old age is described by the poet herself with the indicative ἔμαρψε. The hearsay is thus strictly restricted to Tithonus’ alleged immortality. Moreover, the verb ἔφαντο often appears elsewhere in contexts ‘of false hopes or promises’ in epic,<sup>155</sup> a traditional reference which would resonate effectively here: they said (or ‘thought’) that Tithonus was immortal, free from the usual handicaps of mortality, but this was ultimately not true. However, in spite of these supporting arguments, we should question Bettarini’s neat notion of a continuous development from one version of the Tithonus myth to another, an evolutionary model which fails to account for the potential of an ongoing interchange and dialogue between different versions in different contexts. We have, after all, already seen potential hints of Tithonus’ cicada transformation in the *Iliad*, while even the Homeric dawn periphrases do not explicitly contradict the version of Tithonus’ continuous ageing. Elsewhere in the *Iliad*, Tithonus is named as a son of Laomedon, a brother of Priam and

---

<sup>153</sup> Peisander: Braswell (1992) 57.

<sup>154</sup> For the different versions: Rosenmeyer (1969) 243; Braswell (1992) 54-55. Contrast Loscalzo (1988) 72. Cf. *Eur. IA* 78, where παλαιούς similarly appears to restate tradition against Thucydides’ recent rationalisation of the Tyndarid oath (Willink (1971) 347-48). Such polemic fits the authors’ chronology: Pherecydes’ *Historiai* has been dated between 508/7 and 476/5 BCE (Jacoby (1947) 33), although a date in the early 470s seems most plausible (Huxley (1973) 140-141). *Nemean* 1 is dated after the foundation of Aetna in 476/5 BCE; Braswell (1992) 25-27 suggests 469 BCE.

<sup>155</sup> Graziosi – Haubold (2010) 225.

cousin of Anchises (*Il.*20.237). Even if he had not achieved eternal youth, therefore, he would still have been within the usual life cycle of a human being during the events of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.<sup>156</sup> There is, in short, no reason for seeing the Homeric formula as evidence for an earlier, more primitive version of the myth in which Tithonus enjoyed an unblemished immortality.

The anomaly of the past tense has also been considerably overplayed; it is not in fact without parallel. Besides the archaic and classical examples cited by other scholars,<sup>157</sup> it is particularly worth comparing Aratus' Hellenistic account of Orion's rape of Artemis and the huntsman's subsequent death from a scorpion sting (*Phaen.*634-46). Just as in Sappho, this tale is attributed to the talk of the poet's predecessors with the imperfect ἔφαντο (προτέρων λόγος, οἳ μιν ἔφαντο, *Phaen.*637), and it also transitions from an infinitive to a simple indicative during the course of its narration (ἐλκῆσαι, *Phaen.*638; ἡ δὲ...ἐπετείλατο, *Phaen.*641). Yet it ends with a present φασί in a kind of ring composition (*Phaen.*645), marking the complementarity of past and present speech. Both φασί and ἔφαντο can thus be used to gesture to other traditions, even within a single passage. Despite its attractions, therefore, we cannot maintain the distinction which Bettarini draws between the two versions of the Tithonus myth, or the significance he places on Sappho's imperfect. Rather, I contend, ἔφαντο functions like any other index of hearsay, whether in the present or a past tense, alerting an audience member to other tellings of this myth and inviting them to supplement it with their wider knowledge. Indeed, if anything, the rare epic imperfect adds to the Homeric flavour of these lines, reinforcing the potential connection with the hexametric *Homeric Hymn*. As in Ibycus, Bacchylides, Theognis and others, Sappho's appeal to hearsay indexes her engagement

<sup>156</sup> Carrara (2011) 93 notes that in the *Hymn*, Aphrodite claims that Dawn stayed away from Tithonus' bed as soon as his first grey hairs appeared (*HhAphr.*228-30), but this may be rhetorical exaggeration to suit her immediate argument.

<sup>157</sup> E.g. Edmunds (2006) 24n.10: ἐπενθόμεθα (*Il.*9.524); μῦθον...ὄν ποτ' ἤκουσ'...ἔτι παῖς ὦν (*Ar.Lys.*781-2). de Jong (2010) 159-60: Ἑλλήνων μὲν τινὲς...ἔλεξαν (*Hdt.*2.20 ~ Thales of Miletus). Willigers (2017) 122: ὡς φάσαν (*Il.*4.373). Cf. Westlake (1977) 349 on Thucydides: 'there does not, however, seem to be much significance in his choice of tense, and it is seldom clear why he prefers the present to the past or vice versa'.

with wider traditions and texts surrounding Tithonus, inviting her audience to supplement unmentioned details of the myth.

### II.3.4 Lyric Innovation: Faux Footnoting?

So far, we have encountered numerous cases where lyricists' appeals to hearsay footnote and signal interactions with other texts and traditions. But it is worth asking whether such indexical appeals to hearsay are always so 'straight', or whether they may sometimes conceal a degree of literary innovation. We have already seen Aphrodite bend the truth of tradition in her eponymous *Homeric Hymn*. And in lyric poetry, too, we can identify a number of similar cases where tradition is invoked precisely at points where it is creatively refashioned. Naturally, such an examination is severely hampered by our limited evidence for earlier traditions and literature, and it is often impossible to determine whether some specific element in a narrative is novel or traditional. Yet in spite of this degree of uncertainty, we can still explore at least a few possible cases of indexed innovation, especially in the work of Pindar.

On a number of occasions, Pindar pointedly alters the literary tradition to heighten the parallelism between a myth and his contemporary present, or to incorporate a primarily local myth into the traditional Panhellenic canon. In such cases, he often appeals to hearsay to embellish his account with the veneer of traditional authority. In *Pythian* 1, for example, the Theban poet introduces Philoctetes as a parallel for the Sicilian tyrant Hieron, recalling the Greek hero's physical infirmity, rescue from Lemnos and key role in the sack of Troy (*Pyth.*1.50-55). The introductory *φαντί* (*Pyth.*1.52) marks the general traditionality of this myth, nodding to the hero's gruesome snake wound and Helenus' prophecy that Troy could not be taken without Philoctetes and Heracles' bow, familiar from the Epic Cycle and elsewhere.<sup>158</sup> But it

---

<sup>158</sup> Snake wound: *Il.*2.721-25 (esp. ἔλκεϊ μοχθίζοντα, *Il.*2.723 ~ ἔλκεϊ τειρόμενον, *Pyth.*1.52; cf. Quint.Smyrn.461); *Cypr.*arg.9b (cf. Quintus' later indexing: φασίν, Quint.Smyrn.9.385; ἀνθρώποισι καὶ ὕστερον ἔσσομένοισι, Quint.Smyrn.9.391). Prophecy: *Il.**Parv.*arg.2b; Bacchyl.*Dith.*fr.7; cf. μοιρίδιον ἦν, *Pyth.*1.55.

also authorises a patently untraditional element: in other versions of the myth, from the *Little Iliad* onwards, Philoctetes was cured of his wounds before he entered battle.<sup>159</sup> In Pindar, by contrast, he continues to ‘walk with a weak body’ (ἄσθενεῖ...χρῶτὶ βαίνων, *Pyth.*1.55), a detail that renders him a closer parallel for the poet’s sickly patron.<sup>160</sup> Through the indexical **φαντί**, Pindar thus invokes tradition to legitimise this revamped version of the myth.<sup>161</sup>

However, Pindar does not only re-write tradition to enhance his victors’ glory. At other points, he adapts the mythical past to reflect the contemporary political realities of a victor’s hometown. In *Olympian* 6, for example, Evadna, the mother of Iamus and the Iamid line, is introduced not as the true biological daughter of Aeyptus, the king of Arcadia (as was traditional), but rather as his foster daughter. Instead, her true parents are said (**λέγεται**, *Ol.*6.29) to have been Poseidon and Pitana, the homonymous heroine of a Spartan city. As scholars have noted, this genealogy appears to reflect the contemporary politics of Pindar’s own day, in which the most famous Iamid prophet, Teisamenus of Elis, had been granted Spartan citizenship.<sup>162</sup> By incorporating the Spartan Pitana into Iamus’ genealogy, Pindar integrates his contemporary reality into the mythical past. And by appealing to hearsay at this very moment, he legitimises this addition with a veneer of traditional authority. In the words of Pavlou, he ‘manages to present the recent insertion into the Iamid genealogy as already traditional and socially authoritative.’<sup>163</sup>

<sup>159</sup> *Il.Parv.*arg.2c; cf. Quint.Smyrn.9.459-79.

<sup>160</sup> Cf. Gentili et al. (1995) 347. Hieron’s sickness: *Pyth.*3, esp. 63-76.

<sup>161</sup> Cf. Spelman (2018b) §II. Cf. too *Nem.*9.39-40 where the indexed assertion that Hector fought by the Scamander (**λέγεται, κλέος**) is not paralleled by extant literature, where Hector never strictly fights besides the river (von Leutsch (1859) 68 suggests a reference to Hector’s slaying of Protesilaus, but this is connected with the seashore, not the river: *Cypr.*arg.10a, fr.22). However, this detail enhances the parallel with Pindar’s *laudandus* Chromius, who is praised for fighting successfully by the Sicilian river Helorus (*Nem.*9.40-42): Braswell (1998) 121-23.

<sup>162</sup> Hdt.9.33-35; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1886) 162-85; Huxley (1975) 28-30.

<sup>163</sup> Pavlou (2012) 108. Cf. *Ol.*9.49 (**λέγοντι**), authorising Pindar’s adaptation of the history of Opous to foreshadow Epharmostus’ victories, perhaps alongside an echo of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*: D’Alessio (2005b) 220-26; Pavlou (2008) 554-60.

Finally, Pindar also appeals to the authority of hearsay when imbuing local, epichoric traditions with a Panhellenic pedigree, as in the mythical *aetion* of Rhodes in *Olympian* 7. The poet introduces the emergence of the island from the sea as the ‘**ancient talk of men**’ (*Ol.*7.54-57):

φαντὶ δ’ ἀνθρώπων παλαιαί  
 ῥήσιες, οὐπω, ὅτε χθόνα δατέοντο Ζεὺς τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι,  
 φανεράν ἐν πελάγει Ῥόδον ἔμμεν ποντίῳ,  
 ἀλμυροῖς δ’ ἐν βένθεσιν νᾶσον κεκρύφθαι

The narrative continues with Helios, the Sun-God, failing to gain a share of land because of his absence during the lot-taking; but he sees Rhodes below the sea and requests it as his future domain when it rises (*Ol.*7.58-71). Here, once more, the language of hearsay and antiquity combine to index a mythical reference, alongside the specification of a community of ἄνθρωποι (cf. §II.2.2: 67-68). However, as the Pindaric scholia note, this tradition of Rhodes’ submergence is not attested in literary sources before Pindar (*Σ Ol.*7.101). Rather, the scholia suggest that the poet is drawing on ancient local traditions, a plausible suggestion (*Σ Ol.*7.100a, 101). As Kowalzig has demonstrated, ‘the presence’ of Helios ‘and the importance of his legends on Rhodes at an early time...are undeniable’.<sup>164</sup> It is worth noting, however, that the divine division of lots has a significant literary heritage of its own, going back at least to Poseidon’s account of the threeway division of the world in the *Iliad* (15.187-93). Kowalzig has highlighted Pindar’s numerous verbal connections with the Homeric passage,<sup>165</sup> but also notes that the Pindaric scene exhibits a significant discrepancy with its epic forebear: in Homer, the earth remained common to all (γαῖα δ’ ἔτι ξυνὴ πάντων, *Il.*15.193), while in Pindar it is precisely the earth that is divided up (ὅτε χθόνα δατέοντο, 55; χώρας ἀκλάρωτον, 59).<sup>166</sup> Pindar thus appropriates and adapts the authority of the literary tradition to bolster local myth.

<sup>164</sup> Kowalzig (2007) 243-44.

<sup>165</sup> Kowalzig (2007) 243: ‘the division (δέδασται 189–δατέοντο 55) of earth is performed by mixing (παλλομένων 191–ἄμπαλον 61) and drawing lots (ἐλαχον/ἐλαχε/ἐλαχ’ 190/1/2–ἐνδειξεν λάχος 58).’

<sup>166</sup> Kowalzig (2007) 243n.58.

The introduction of the story with a gesture to ancient hearsay does not so much paper over Pindar's own innovations as much as it endows a local and little-known story with the prestige of canonicity.

In lyric poetry, we thus do not find out-and-out mythological inventions disguised as traditional tales, but rather slight adaptations of pre-existing myths to reflect and enhance contemporary circumstances. In such cases, appeals to tradition bestow an element of canonicity on contemporary and epichoric traditions, inscribing them into the wider storehouse of communal song.<sup>167</sup> This perfectly fits the more general practice of epinician, which often juxtaposes local figures and traditions with the major 'panHellenic' myths of the Greek world. But it is worth stressing that this is not solely a Pindaric or even epinician phenomenon. We can identify a comparable instance of authorised 'innovation' in another Attic *skolion*, on the immortality of the Athenian tyrant slayer Harmodius (894 PMG):

φίλταθ' Ἀρμόδι', οὐ τί που τέθνηκας,  
νήσοις δ' ἐν μακάρων σέ **φασιν** εἶναι,  
ἵνα περ ποδώκης Ἀχιλεὺς  
Τυδεΐδην τέ **φασι** τὸν ἐσθλὸν Διομήδεα.

This text, as transmitted, contains two indexical appeals to tradition within the space of four lines. The second, if retained,<sup>168</sup> is the more straightforward and evokes wider traditions surrounding Achilles' and Diomedes' immortalisation, here expressed through traditionally epic language.<sup>169</sup> Achilles, in particular, was associated with a range of afterlife locations after his death: besides the Odyssean Underworld (*Od.*11.471-540), he was also situated on Leuke

<sup>167</sup> Cf. Pavlou (2012) 108-9.

<sup>168</sup> The transmitted final verse is unmetrical, which has prompted a host of conjectures (Fabbro (1995) 32, 151-52), usually excising φασί, τὸν ἐσθλόν, or Διομήδεα. I am inclined to follow Lowth's popular conjecture and retain this φασί (Τυδεΐδην τέ φασιν Διομήδεα), but even if the verb is excised, this has no bearing on the first φασίν, which is the key to my argument here.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. ποδώκης Ἀχιλλεύς (*Il.*18.234); Τυδεΐδην Διομήδεα (*Il.*6.235, 10.150). If we retain **φασί**, we could also consider putting Achilles in the accusative, so that he is explicitly part of the indirect speech (ποδώκε' Ἀχιλέα Ilgen; ποδώκη τ' Ἀχιλέα Edmonds).

(*Aeth.arg.*4b; *Pind.Nem.*4.49-50), the Elysian fields (*Ibyc.fr.*291; *Simon.fr.*558) and – as here – the isles of the Blessed (*Pind.Ol.*2.70-80; *Plat.Symp.*179e-180b). Diomedes, meanwhile, was immortalised by Athena, at least according to Pindar (*Nem.*10.7) and apparently also Ibycus (*fr.*294). The second **φασί** thus marks the traditionality of these heroes' afterlives, while also perhaps nodding to the competing alternatives for Achilles' final resting place.

The first **φασίiv**, however, is more arresting, since it attributes the same immortal status to a historical individual, the Athenian tyrant slayer Harmodius. This youth famously lost his life alongside his adult lover Aristogeiton in their attempt to kill the Athenian tyrant Hippias and his brother Hipparchus in 514 BCE. In the grim light of history, their behaviour does not seem equal to that of Homer's greatest heroes: it was an act of revenge, motivated by a personal slight, and only partially successful. The pair managed to kill Hipparchus but not Hippias, who responded to their plot with a harsher and more repressive rule. Despite these realities, however, Harmodius and Aristogeiton became lauded as 'tyrant slayers' in the popular imagination and were refashioned as the poster boys of Athenian democracy, celebrated with statues, song and hero cult.<sup>170</sup> This *skolion*, alongside others on the same theme (893, 895-96 *PMG*), forms part of this larger ideological development of the Harmodius myth, setting the hero on a par with the greatest warriors from the Trojan war: after all, we have already seen in other *skolia* how the two heroes mentioned here, Diomedes and Achilles, were singled out as the greatest warriors who went to Troy (898-99 *PMG*, *§II.3.1*: 93-95). In this context, the poet's initial **φασίiv** is thus extremely loaded, drawing on the authority of tradition to authorise this local Athenian legend.

As in Pindar, this innovation is achieved through a creative reworking of tradition. Already in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, the Isles of the Blessed were the home of the prosperous heroes (καὶ τοὶ μὲν ναίουσιν ... | ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι ... | ὄλβιοι ἥρωες, *Hes.Op.*170-72). But the *skolion* appropriates this long-standing epic tradition of heroic immortality for a specifically Athenian purpose, aligning a local hero with the panHellenic greats.<sup>171</sup> In so doing,

<sup>170</sup> *Hdt.*5.55-56, 6.123; *Thuc.*6.54.1-59.1; *Arist.Resp.Ath.*18.3-6; Taylor (1981); Monoson (2000) 21-50.

<sup>171</sup> Cf. Taylor (1981) 66-69 on the Harmodius *skolia*'s appropriation of the epic tradition.

it may also evoke Achilles as a prime model for Harmodius' pederastic relationship with Aristogeiton. Elsewhere in Attic literature, Achilles and Patroclus are mentioned as ancient analogues for the tyrant-slayers (Aesch.*Tim.*140, 142; Plat.*Symp.*179e-180b, 182c),<sup>172</sup> and in Plato's *Symposium* Phaedrus claims that it is precisely Achilles' love for his friend which guaranteed his immortalisation on the Isles of the Blessed (179e-180b). Achilles here is thus not only an exemplar of heroic immortality, but also of someone who has achieved it through pederastic devotion. As in Pindar, a local tradition is thus bolstered by the authority of the mythical past at the very same time that it is itself incorporated into the annals of song. The indexical **φασί**ν both authorises and cements the traditionality of the Harmodius myth.<sup>173</sup>

Appeals to hearsay in lyric, therefore, not only signpost allusions to pre-existing traditions and texts, but also mark and authorise the creative reworking of tradition, building on the epic example we have already seen in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. These are not so much cases of pure invention and fabrication, as occasions on which poets rework and revise traditional material. Our limited access to the whole range of lyric poetry inhibits a fuller perspective on such practice, but even from these glimpses, we see that lyric poets exploited the indexical potential of hearsay not only to mark and supplement their allusions to pre-existing texts and traditions, but also to authorise their innovative departures from the trodden path.

---

<sup>172</sup> Cf. Fantuzzi (2012) 225.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. another *skolion* in which both tyrant slayers are promised ever-lasting κλέος in similarly epic language (αἰεὶ σφῶν κλέος ἔσσεται κατ' αἶαν, 896.1 PMG).



## II.4 Conclusions

In both archaic epic and lyric poetry, appeals to hearsay frequently evoke wider traditions and texts. In archaic epic, we have seen Homer and his fellow poets gesture to the traditional background of many myths, signalling the poet's mastery and control of the many strands of song. Sometimes, these epicists gesture to the authority of tradition for specific details of their story (Peisistratus' speed; Nestor's age; the gods' secret love-making), but at other points, they agonistically position their own stories against the tales told by others (the *Iliad* on Achilles' upbringing and immortality) or against other whole traditions or texts (the *Odyssey* and female catalogue poetry; the *Iliad* and theogonic myth; the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*). Through these indexes of hearsay, epic poets constructed the contours of a nascent literary history, within and against which they positioned their own poems. We find here an underlying awareness of an epic archive, a storehouse of song.

Both these aspects of indexical hearsay (the encyclopaedic and agonistic) can also be traced directly into archaic lyric poetry. Here too, lyricists appealed to anonymous tradition as a source of authority, whether they were invoking a mythical *fabula* at large or a specific source text (Sappho on Leda's egg; Attic *skolia* on Ajax; Simonides on Hesiod's *Arete*; Pindar on Cheiron's *Hypothekai*). And here too, they positioned their versions against competing narrative alternatives (Theognis on Atalanta; Bacchylides on Heracles' tears; Pindar on Heracles' infancy). But in lyric, we also find something new, a tendency to invoke tradition precisely at points of narrative ellipsis, an invitation for audiences to fill in the blanks of what a poet has left unsaid (Ibycus on Cassandra; Sappho on Andromache's marriage and Tithonus). As we remarked above, such a process of signposted supplementation reflects a key aspect of lyric myth-making: a preference for brief exempla over extensive, continuous narrative. In addition to this phenomenon, however, lyric poetry also features more cases of indexed innovation, instances where tradition is creatively reworked, but legitimised through an appeal to hearsay (Pindar's numerous connections of past and present; the Attic *skolion* on Harmodius) – an aspect that we already saw developing in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*.

Lyric poets thus built on and developed an allusive device already well-established in archaic epic.

Indeed, from the evidence we have, it is tempting to mark out a neat process of development for indexical hearsay through the ages from Homer to Pindar, centred on an increase in its usage to cite specific texts and to conceal literary innovations, culminating in the poetry of Pindar. The basic contours of such a development are clear, but we should be wary of treating it as too continuous a process. After all, we have already seen possible cases of direct textual citation in the *Iliad* (on Typhoeus), *Odyssey* (on Nestor) and *Works and Days* (on Oath's birth), near the very start of the (visible) literary tradition. The prevalence of indexes in Pindar, moreover, may to some degree reflect the better survival of his poetry, rather than a substantial shift of gear or watershed moment. It is difficult to draw anything of statistical significance from the evidence we have.

If we had more space or time, we could also look beyond Pindar to explore how indexical hearsay continued to function in Attic drama and the prose writing of historians and philosophers in the fifth and fourth centuries, where a comparable allusivity is in play.<sup>174</sup> Indeed, it is striking that even as literacy and writing began to play an increasingly important role in the preservation and commemoration of literature, this allusive trope maintained a fiction of pure orality: other texts continued to be 'what people say', rather than 'what they write'.<sup>175</sup> And even as poets began to name their contemporaries and predecessors directly, they still regularly employed the vague anonymity of hearsay to signpost their allusions.

Given the endurance and permanence of this phenomenon throughout early Greek literature, even into a time of writing and named authors, it is worth asking what motivated and maintained this allusive strategy. What advantages does it bring ancient poets and their audiences? One answer could be the influence of the epic tradition: appeals to tradition at large in early epic could have established a motif that later poets adopted into their own repertoire.

---

<sup>174</sup> Drama: e.g. Soph.*Phil.*334-35 (ὥς λέγουσιν ~ *Il.*21.278; *Aeth.*arg.3a; Aesch.fr.350.8). Thucydides: Westlake (1977); Gray (2011). Herodotus: Fehling (1989); Török (2014) 54-117. Philosophers: e.g. Pl.*Phd.*69c-d (φασίιν ~ Orph.576 PEG: Cristóbal (2009) 47-50).

<sup>175</sup> Cf. Schenkeveld (1992) on the prose uses of ἀκούω to mean 'I read'.

Yet this alone does not seem a satisfactory solution – later poets were not restricted by the burden of their epic inheritance, and nor does this explain why epic poets themselves employed the device so readily. We might then focus on the anonymity of the device: on the one hand, it allowed poets to bolster their claims through the abstract authority of the poetic and mythical past, deriving legitimacy from a monolithic and uncontestable ‘tradition’. Yet on the other, it proved a way of subsuming rival poets into a vague and faceless mass of transmitted words, a means to avoid giving them any direct ‘air time’. Either way, however, it was also a means of fostering a special and direct connection with poetic audiences, flattering them as part of an in-crowd who were familiar with the traditions of myth, with all that people say and tell.

At the very start of the Greek literary record, therefore, indexical hearsay was a well-established and significant allusive tool. Well before the rise of Alexandria and Rome, it was deeply engrained in the archaic grammar of allusion. In the sections that follow, we shall reach similar conclusions about other allusive indexes – those of memory and time. As our evidence continues to accumulate, so too does our need to reconsider our traditional narratives of literary history.



## **PART III.**

### **POETIC MEMORY**



### III.1 Introduction

In this section, our focus is the indexical potential of memory, occasions where the reminiscences of narrators or characters in the fictional world coincide with those of a poet's audience. In later Hellenistic and Roman poetry, this frequently involves an alignment between characters' autobiographical memories and the external audience's knowledge of the literary tradition, as when Ovid's Ariadne recalls her Catullan past (*Fast.*3.471-76) or Mars quotes his Ennian self (*Met.*14.812-15).<sup>1</sup> But it can also extend beyond the purely autobiographical to embrace the recollection of more distant literary passages beyond an individual character's fictional life: in Apollonius' *Argonautica*, Medea's recollection of the pleasures of life simultaneously recalls Asclepiades' epigrammatic description of them (**μνήσατο** μὲν τερπνῶν ὅσ' ἐνὶ ζωοῖσι, *Ap.Rhod.*3.813 ~ ἐν ζωοῖσι τὰ τερπνά, *AP* 5.85.3 [*HE* 818]).<sup>2</sup> Her memory does not index an earlier literary treatment of her own life, but rather an unrelated text on a similar theme.

To this indexical potential of memory, we can also add another sphere of personal cognition: knowledge. Just as characters recall events from the literary tradition, so too do they often 'know' or 'recognise' things that would strike an audience as familiar from the literary past. In Lucan's *De Bello Civili*, a frenzied matron prophetically '**recognises**' the disfigured trunk of Pompey at the very same time that an audience would recognise the echo of Priam's own Pompey-like 'nameless corpse' from the *Aeneid* (**agnosco**, 1.685-86 ~ *Aen.*2.557-58).<sup>3</sup> And in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Ulysses' complaint that Ajax does not '**know**' the relief-work of Achilles' shield (*neque...novit*, *Met.*13.291) immediately precedes his near quotation of the

---

<sup>1</sup> §I.1.2: 8-9. Cf. *Ov.Fast.*3.553 (**memor**) ~ *Aen.*4.36 (Thomas (1992) 46n.34).

<sup>2</sup> Sens (2003) 305-6.

<sup>3</sup> Hinds (1998) 8-10. Cf. *Callim.Hecale*.fr.42.4 (**μémνημαι**) ~ *Il.*14.180 (Faber (2017) 83-84), *Od.*19.225-35 (Hunter (2018) 179n.106).

Homeric shield ecphrasis – there is no doubt where Ulysses and Ovid ‘know’ these details from (*Met.*13.292-94 ~ *Il.*18.483-90).<sup>4</sup>

In comparison to the indexical hearsay of the last section, these allusive gestures are dependent not on the external and circulating news of others, but rather on the first-hand, embedded experiences of literary characters. Yet they function in a very similar manner, prompting an audience to recall their own ‘memories’ of the literary tradition. In the chapters that follow, I shall explore how these allusive tropes are already manifest in our earliest Greek poetry.

Before turning to archaic poetry, however, it is worth acknowledging that later Greek writers often employ the language of memory and knowledge when quoting other works, a practice which demonstrates their strong indexical potential, at least by the classical period. In a fragment of Philippides, a poet of New Comedy, a quotation of Euripides’ *Stheneboea* is preceded by the instruction to ‘remember Euripides’ (Εὐριπίδου μνήσθητι, fr.18 K–A), while in Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, Dionysus explicitly claims that he is ‘recollecting’ an iambic verse of Hipponax (Ἰάμβον Ἰππώνακτος ἀνεμυμνησκόμην, *Ran.*661).<sup>5</sup> In Plato’s *Meno*, Socrates similarly precedes his quotation of Theognis by asking his interlocutor whether he ‘knows’ what the poet says (οἶσθ’, *Meno* 95c-d). And the scholars of Athenaeus and the ancient scholia frequently introduce texts, cross-references and mythical figures with the language of memory.<sup>6</sup> Most significant of all, however, is the famous fragment of Antiphanes’ *Poiesis*, which thematises the activation of memory and knowledge in a literary context: the speaker claims that the subject matter of tragedy is so ‘familiar’ to the audience (οἱ λόγοι | ὑπὸ τῶν θεατῶν εἰσιν ἐγνωρισμένοι, fr.189.2-3), that a poet need only ‘remind’ them of it (ὥσθ’ ὑπομνησαι μόνον | δεῖ τὸν ποιητὴν, fr.189.4-5), and that as soon as someone says ‘Oedipus’, ‘they know all the rest’ (τὰ δ’ ἄλλα πάντ’ ἴσασιν, fr.189.6). By the classical period, the

<sup>4</sup> Cf. too *Met.*15.365 (*cognita*) ~ *Georg.*4.538-47 (Solodow (1988) 228); *Met.*9.508 (*novi*) ~ *Od.*10.7, Euripides *Aeolus*; also Fantuzzi (2004) 217-18 on *novi*/γινώσκω marking engagement with the bucolic Cyclops.

<sup>5</sup> Dionysus’ memory may be humorously faulty: Σ *Ran.*661 ascribes the quoted verse to Ananius (fr.1 IEG), not Hipponax: Rotstein (2010) 201-4.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Σ *Ar.Eq.*762a(I) (μῆμνηται); Σ *Ap.Rhod.*1.996-7 (μῆμνηται); *Athen.*1.5b (μῆμνηται), 7.309e (μνημνεύει).



discourse of recollection and knowledge was thus intimately integrated into the practice of literary citation and referencing. In the chapters that follow, I shall argue that we can trace this discourse even further back in time to the poetry of the archaic period.



## III.2 Epic Recall

Memory is central to early Greek poetics, both as a prerequisite for its production and as a primary function of its performance.<sup>7</sup> Oral poets' very ability to recall, embellish and creatively retell their inherited tradition is heavily reliant on their own powers of memory,<sup>8</sup> while a key goal of the epic genre itself is to preserve the memory of the heroic exploits of a bygone era, acting as a community's storehouse for past deeds which articulate shared values and ethics.<sup>9</sup> In a primarily oral society, where such a past could not easily be recorded, preserved and consulted through writing, epic song was a major vehicle for the transmission of a society's (ever-changing) heritage, values and identity: a vehicle for the transmission and preservation of cultural memory.

The centrality of memory to early Greek epic is readily apparent from our extant texts, especially in the prominent position they attribute to the Muses as inspirers of epic song, the daughters of 'Memory' herself (Mnemosyne). In the famous invocation at the start of the Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* 2, the narrator admits that he could not name all those who came to Troy unless the Muses were to 'recall' them for him (μνησαίαθ', *Il.*2.492), while Hesiod's *Theogony* begins with a miniature Hymn to the Muses which includes a prominent description of their birth from Mnemosyne (*Theog.*53-62), as well as an emphasis on their powers of knowledge (ἴδμεν...ἴδμεν, *Theog.*27-28). Crucially, the Muses are a distinctive feature of Greek poetry, with no parallel in Near Eastern traditions, where literary creation and preservation were instead associated with writing.<sup>10</sup> Their prominence in Homer onwards highlights the

---

<sup>7</sup> Memory in early Greek poetry and thought: Detienne (1967) 9-27 = (1996) 39-52; Vernant (1969) 49-94 = (1983) 73-123; Simondon (1982); Bouvier (1997), (2002); Bakker (2002), (2008); Clay (2011a) 109-119; Castagnoli – Ceccarelli (forthcoming).

<sup>8</sup> Notopoulos (1938) 465-73; Calame (2011) 356.

<sup>9</sup> Havelock (1963) 186-87; Bouvier (2002) 173-74.

<sup>10</sup> West (1997) 170; Metcalf (2015) 137-50. The Muses reflect a broader Indo-European tradition of poetry as recall: West (2007) 33.

core and unique role of memory in early Greek poetics. Indeed, it is such a central concept that ‘remembering’ in epic often stands as a synonym for ‘singing’.<sup>11</sup>

This emphasis on recollection is further reflected in epic’s concern to preserve κλέα ἄνδρῶν, as well as epic characters’ own interest in their future renown and immortality (§II.2: 59). Heroes aspire to be remembered for all posterity, especially by means of a prominent tomb,<sup>12</sup> or by the report of others (*Od.*8.241-45). And even poets themselves wish to be ‘remembered’, like the narrator in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (μνήσασθ’, *HhAp.*3.167)

Set against this emphasis on memory, however, early Greek poetry also displays a reciprocal concern and almost perverse fascination with its opposite: forgetfulness. Material sites of memory repeatedly fail to preserve an individual’s *kleos* for very long in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,<sup>13</sup> and Homer’s heroes constantly fight against the overbearing threat of oblivion. In the *Iliad*, Achilles has a famous choice between an anonymous long life and the renown of a heroic, premature death, while in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus’ fame is reliant on his safe *nostos*, which is repeatedly threatened during his adventures. He is repeatedly ‘recalled’ by other characters, almost in an attempt to keep him and his story ‘alive’,<sup>14</sup> but numerous obstacles raise the threat of forgetfulness, including the Lotus-Eaters (*Od.*9.93-97), Circe (*Od.*10.234-36), and especially the Sirens, whose very ability to enchant passers-by mirrors the power of song (*Od.*12.39-46).<sup>15</sup> In the Greek world, moreover, Helen’s Egyptian drugs in Sparta threaten obscurity, bringing a ‘forgetfulness of every ill’ (κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἀπάντων, *Od.* 4.219-30),<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Moran (1975); Richardson (1974) 325; Metcalf (2015) 142.

<sup>12</sup> *Il.*7.84-91; *Od.*1.239-41 = 14.369-71, 11.75-76, 24.32-34, 24.84.

<sup>13</sup> *Il.*2.813-14, 23.326-34; Lynn-George (1987) 252-276; Ford (1992) 131-171; Grethlein (2008) 28-35. The impermanence of physical sites of memory is an implicit foil to the immortalising power of song: Ford (1992) 146; Grethlein (2008) 32; Garcia Jr. (2013).

<sup>14</sup> Penelope (μεμνημένη, *Od.*1.343; μέμνητ’, *Od.*24.195; Mueller (2007)); Telemachus (μνησθῆναι, *Od.*4.118); Menelaus (μεμνημένος, *Od.*4.151); Phoebus (μνησαμένω, *Od.*20.205); Antinous (μνήμων, *Od.*21.95). Many characters are also encouraged by others to remember him, including Nestor (μνήσαι, *Od.*3.101), Zeus (μνήσαι, *Od.*4.765), and Athena-Mentor (μνήσαι, *Od.*22.208).

<sup>15</sup> Pucci (1979) 126-28.

<sup>16</sup> Bergren (1981); Mueller (2007) 355-56.

while even the Muses are agents of oblivion as much as recall: in the *Theogony*, Mnemosyne is said to have given birth to them specifically as ‘forgetfulness of evils and relief from anxieties’ (λημοσύνην τε κακῶν ἄμπαυμά τε μερμηράων, *Theog.*55), while a poet who sings ‘quickly forgets his sorrows and does not remember his anguish at all’ (αἶψ’ ὃ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται οὐδέ τι κηδέων | μέμνηται, *Theog.*102-3).<sup>17</sup> This reflects a key ambivalence surrounding ancient perceptions of the power of song: it could commemorate and memorialise some deeds, but also omit others, consigning them to oblivion.

Memory and its opposite, therefore, were of central importance for early Greek poetry. Modern scholars, too, have been no less interested in exploring the power and significance of memory’s various facets in these poems, bolstered by the recent explosion of interest in memory studies in the humanities more generally. Especially productive has been the application of concepts from cognitive psychology to both Homeric epics,<sup>18</sup> alongside the fruitful examination of the social and cultural features of remembrance.<sup>19</sup> Yet more can still be said on the self-reflexive and indexical character of memory in early Greek epic. Already in these texts, as in later Graeco-Roman literature, memory and knowledge play an important indexical role, a means of both gesturing to and incorporating other traditions.

In the sections that follow, we shall again begin with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, exploring how the language of memory, forgetting and knowledge serves to signpost both inter- and intra-textual references within each poem (§III.2.1-2). After establishing the general contours of this pattern, we shall turn to cases in which characters’ reminiscences appear to involve tendentious and partial misrememberings of tradition (§III.2.3), as well as those in which characters exhibit an uncanny and proleptic knowledge of future events (§III.2.4). We shall close by exploring the evidence for indexical memory elsewhere in archaic Greek epic and then draw some more general conclusions (§III.2.5).

---

<sup>17</sup> Walsh (1984) 22-24.

<sup>18</sup> Minchin (2001), (2005), (2006), (2007). More generally, Rubin (1995).

<sup>19</sup> Martin (1989) 77-88; Grethlein (2008); Nikkanen (2012).

### III.2.1 Intertextual Memories

In both Homeric poems, characters repeatedly recall events from their own past which were also familiar from the larger mythical tradition. Whenever a character remembers or reminds another of an earlier experience, the audience are similarly invited to recall their own knowledge of this episode.<sup>20</sup> As we shall see, such indexical memory is generally less agonistic than the appeals to hearsay we encountered in the previous section, but it nevertheless serves an encyclopaedic and incorporative function: through characters' reminiscences, the poet gestures to the broader web of tradition, within which he situates his own work.

On the human plane, such cases of indexical memory point to recent episodes of the Trojan war expedition. When Peisistratus reminisces about his brother Antilochus in *Odyssey* 4, his speech is indexed not only by an appeal to anonymous hearsay (φασί, *Od.*4.201, §II.2.1: 62-63), but also by the narrator's introductory emphasis on his act of memory (*Od.*4.187-89):

μνήσατο γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονος Ἀντιλόχοιο,  
τόν ῥ' Ἡοῦς ἔκτεινε φαεινῆς ἀγλαὸς υἱός.  
τοῦ ὃ γ' ἐπιμνησθεῖς ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευεν·

Peisistratus' recollection of past events within the fictional world of the narrative precipitates and coincides with the audience's own recall of a familiar episode from the Trojan war tradition: as we have noted before (§II.2.1: 62-63), Antilochus' death was narrated in the *Aethiopis* of the Epic Cycle (*Aeth.*arg.2c). But the tradition evidently pre-dated it: Memnon's periphrastic introduction here by the matronymic 'son of Dawn' (Ἡοῦς...υἱός) suggests that he was a familiar figure of myth,<sup>21</sup> while the traditionality of the whole *fabula* is also

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Moran (1975); Currie (2016) 140-43.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *Od.*11.522; Hes.*Theog.*984-85; Alcman.fr.68.

presupposed by Iliadic allusions to it.<sup>22</sup> Indeed, when Peisistratus goes on to note that Menelaus surely knew Antilochus (ἴδμεναι, *Od.*4.200), the overall message is reinforced: Antilochus was a familiar and memorable figure of myth.

More often in Homer, however, such instances of indexical memory occur in two-person dialogues in which one individual challenges the other's memory of the past. When Achilles encounters Aeneas in *Iliad* 20, for example, he asks his adversary whether he remembers the previous time (ἤδη...καὶ ἄλλοτε) he was routed from the foothills of Mt. Ida (*Il.*20.187-96):

ἤδη μὲν σέ γέ φημι καὶ ἄλλοτε δουρὶ φοβῆσαι.  
 ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε πέρ σε βοῶν ἄπο μοῦνον ἐόντα  
 σεῦα κατ' Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ταχέεσσι πόδεσσι  
 καρπαλίμως; τότε δ' οὐ τι μετατροπαλίζεο φεύγων.  
 ἔνθεν δ' ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν  
 πέρσα μεθορμηθεὶς σὺν Ἀθήνῃ καὶ Διὶ πατρί,  
 ληϊάδας δὲ γυναῖκας ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας  
 ἦγον· ἀτὰρ σὲ Ζεὺς ἐρρύσατο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι.  
 ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν ἐρύεσθαι οἶομαι, ὥς ἐνὶ θυμῷ  
 βάλλεται

Achilles invites Aeneas to recall their previous encounter as a parallel for the present, establishing expectations about the outcome of this latest meeting. Besides its paradigmatic force, however, Achilles' recollection also invites Homer's audience to recall their own memory of this episode from the larger epic tradition.<sup>23</sup> According to Proclus' summary, this encounter featured in the *Cypria*, alongside Achilles' sacking of Lyrnessus, Pedasus and other surrounding settlements (*Cypr.*arg.11c-d).<sup>24</sup> And here too, there are good grounds for supposing that this encounter, like much else in the *Cypria*, pre-existed the *Iliad*. Achilles' raids

<sup>22</sup> For the relationship between the *Aethiopis/Memnonis* tradition and *Iliad*: Bouvier (2002) 379-401; Heitsch (2005), (2008); Currie (2006) 23-41, (2016) 55-72; Burgess (2009) esp.72-92; Rengakos (2015) 315-17. Conversely, West (2003c) argues that Memnon and the plot of the *Aethiopis* are post-Iliadic, but see Kullmann (2005); Currie (2006) 27-28; Burgess (2009) 28-29.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Moran (1975) 201-2; Currie (2016) 141.

<sup>24</sup> Achilles' raids: Leaf (1912) 242-52; Kullmann (1960) 284-91; Taplin (1986).

appear early in art,<sup>25</sup> and were a crucial element in the larger *fabula* of the Trojan war, as the occasion for Achilles' acquisition of Briseis as his concubine. Within the *Iliad*, too, they are a recurring point of reference: the narrator mentions how Achilles had previously captured two sons of Priam, Isus and Antiphus, while they were out herding their sheep (*Il.*11.104-6, 111-12 – note **ποτ'** and **πάρος**). Within *Iliad* 20 itself, moreover, Aeneas has already offered his own summary of the episode (*Il.*20.89-96):

οὐ μὲν γὰρ νῦν **πρῶτα** ποδώκεος ἄντ' Ἀχιλλῆος  
 στήσομαι, ἀλλ' **ἤδη** με **καὶ ἄλλοτε** δουρὶ φόβησεν  
 ἐξ Ἰδης, ὅτε βουσὶν ἐπήλυθεν ἡμετέρησι,  
πέρσε δὲ Λυρνησσὸν καὶ Πήδασον· αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ Ζεὺς  
εἰρύσαθ', ὅς μοι ἐπῶρσε μένος λαιψηρά τε γούνα.  
 ἦ κ' ἐδάμην ὑπὸ χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος καὶ Ἀθήνης,  
 ἦ οἱ πρόσθεν ἰοῦσα τίθει φάος ἡδ' ἐκέλευεν  
 ἔγχεϊ χαλκείῳ Λέλεγας καὶ Τρῶας ἐναίρειν.

Despite Achilles' polemical suggestion that Aeneas may have forgotten the event, the Trojan is all too mindful of it. Indeed, his account overlaps with that of Achilles in many details, even down to his speedy flight (λαιψηρά τε γούνα, 20.93 ~ ταχέεσσι πόδεσσι | καρπαλίμως, 20.189-90), and it is similarly indexed in temporal terms (οὐ...νῦν **πρῶτα**..., ἀλλ' **ἤδη**...**καὶ ἄλλοτε**). Given the 'cursory manner' of Aeneas' account, Anderson has argued that 'the Iliadic allusions derive from an earlier tradition which was ultimately codified in the *Kypria*',<sup>26</sup> and although he takes this argument no further, additional support for his case can be found in the verbal echoes between Aeneas' and Achilles' narratives, which suggest a consistent and uniform *fabula* underlying both passages. The Trojan prince is driven to Mt. Lyrnessus (Λυρνησσὸν, 20.92 ~ 191, same *sedes*), which Achilles sacks (πέρσε, 20.92 ~ πέρσα, 20.192), and he is saved only by Zeus (Ζεὺς | εἰρύσαθ', 20.92-3 ~ Ζεὺς ἐρύσατο, 20.194). Especially significant, however, is the repeated emphasis on Achilles' routing of Aeneas with his spear (δουρὶ φόβησεν 20.90 ~ δουρὶ φοβῆσαι, 20.187, same *sedes*). These are the only two

<sup>25</sup> A relief amphora from c.650 BCE appears to show Achilles raiding Aeneas' cattle: Burgess (1996) 83n.29 = (2001a) 247n.70.

<sup>26</sup> Anderson (1997) 63. Nagy (1979) 265-75 sees a confrontation between the *Iliad* and an *Aeneid* tradition.



appearances of this phrase in extant Greek literature before the Imperial period (Quint.Smyrn.8.150-51), a fact which suggests that the formula could have been specifically associated with the *fabula* of this episode. By redeploying the phrase twice here, Homer alludes to an established tradition surrounding the early years of the Trojan war and marks the parallel between the two heroes' present (νῦν, 195) and previous (τότε, 190) encounters. Indeed, this current confrontation proves to be a close replay – or 'doublet' – of the earlier meeting. Although Achilles hopes that the gods will not save Aeneas this time (195-96), Poseidon ultimately intervenes to ensure that the Trojan hero escapes alive once more (*Il.*20.288-339, cf. 20.194).<sup>27</sup>

When Achilles asks Aeneas whether he can remember this event, therefore, Homer's audience are invited to draw on their own knowledge of the larger Trojan war tradition. By having the heroes recall their earlier encounter, Homer effectively cites his model for the present scene: Aeneas and Achilles meet again, as they previously had on Mt. Ida. Through the language of memory, Homer gestures to his encyclopaedic control of the whole tradition, replaying an earlier episode with a self-conscious sense of déjà vu.

Such recall of past events can also be activated through the language of knowledge and forgetting. In the *Odyssey*, Penelope asks Antinous whether he is aware of the time when Odysseus saved his father Eupeithes, after he had joined Taphian pirates (ἦ οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅτε, *Od.*16.424). Scholars suspect that this episode may have been invented for its immediate context,<sup>28</sup> but even if that were true, it builds on the traditional associations of the Taphians as pirates and Odysseus' allies, details with which not only Antinous but also Homer's audience would have been familiar.<sup>29</sup> In the *Odyssean Underworld*, Odysseus realises that Ajax has not forgotten the anger he felt because of his defeat in the contest for Achilles' arms (οὐδὲ θανὼν λήσεσθαι ἐμοὶ χόλου εἵνεκα τευχέων | οὐλομένων, *Od.*11.554-55), an event that was a

<sup>27</sup> This episode is also replayed at *Il.*5.311-17: Aeneas only escapes Diomedes after the intervention of his divine mother, Aphrodite. For Diomedes as an '*altera persona*' of Achilles: §I.2.2: 41.

<sup>28</sup> Danek (1998) 326; West (2014a) 251; Currie (2016) 143.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Jones (1992) 79-80. Rohdenberg – Marks (2012) explore the larger *Odyssean* opposition of Taphians and Thesprotians.

central part of his mythical *fabula* (§II.3.1: 93), and again familiar to us from the Cyclic tradition (*Aeth.arg.4d*; *Il.parv.fr.2, arg.1a*). In the *Iliad*, meanwhile, both Achilles and Patroclus are criticised for forgetting the advice they received from their fathers before departing to Troy (σὺ δὲ λήθῃαι, *Il.9.259, 11.790*), nodding to the traditions of pre-war recruitment as attested in the *Cypria* and elsewhere.<sup>30</sup> Through the language of forgetting, memory and knowledge, therefore, the Homeric poet indexes a range of episodes from the wider Trojan war cycle, marking his control of his mythical repertoire.

It is especially on the divine plane, however, that we encounter such cases of indexical memory. Gods, too, can recall recent mythical events, as when Zeus opens the *Odyssey* by recalling the revenge of ‘far-famed’ Orestes (τηλεκλυτός), introducing an analogy that will underlie the whole poem (μνήσατο, ἐπιμνησθείς, *Od.1.29-31*).<sup>31</sup> But more regularly, the gods look back to a more distant age, reflecting their more enduring powers of memory.<sup>32</sup> A favourite subject of such divine recollection is the Greek hero Heracles, whose exploits are a recurring presence in Homer, Hesiod and archaic Greek poetry more generally.<sup>33</sup> Indeed, the frequency and consistency of his appearances, alongside the developed formulaic system

---

<sup>30</sup> For the Phthian embassy, cf. *Il.7.127-28, 9.438-40*. The specific details in these recollections of paternal advice are often considered the invention of the poet, specifically tailored to the speaker’s immediate context: Willcock (1977) 46-7; West (2011a) 33. Hunter (2018) 146 attractively remarks that the accusation of forgetfulness may index this invention: ‘you do not remember, because this never happened’.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *Hes.fr.23a.27-30*; *Nostoi arg.5*. Note ἔκτανε πατροφονῆα ( *Od.1.299, 3.307* ), ἐτείσατο πατροφονῆα ( *3.197* ) ~ ἀπε[τείσατο π]ατροφο[ν]ῆα ( *Hes.fr.23a.29* ). For the ‘Oresteia’ as an underlying paradigm and foil in the *Odyssey*: D’Arms – Hulley (1946); Hölscher (1967); Olson (1990), (1995) 24-42; Katz (1991) 29-53; Felson-Rubin (1994) 93-107; Marks (2008) 17-35; Alden (2017) 77-100.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *Il.2.811-14*: they still recognise Myrine’s tomb, which humans merely believe to be a hill.

<sup>33</sup> *Iliad*: Alden (2000) 38-42; Kelly (2010); West (2011a) 30-31; Barker – Christensen (2014). *Odyssey*: Schein (2002); Andersen (2012); Alden (2017) 173-84. *Hesiodic Catalogue*: Haubold (2005). *Aspis*: Mason (2015) 143-53. Archilochus: *fr.17a.22, 25* (Swift (2014b) 440-2), *fr.286-8*; Alcman: *fr.1* (Davison (1938)). Stesichorus: *Geryoneis* (*frr.5-83*), *Cerberus* (*fr.165*), *Cycnus* (*frr.166-68*); Ibyc.*fr.285, frr.298-300*.

attached to his name, suggest a well-established tradition surrounding the hero,<sup>34</sup> much of which likely went on to shape or influence the later Heracles epics that we know of.<sup>35</sup> The gods' frequent recollections of this former age set the current events at Troy in a broader mythological perspective.

In *Iliad* 8, Athena is frustrated by Zeus' support of the Trojans and complains that he no longer remembers her previous support of his son Heracles (*Il.*8.362-69):

οὐδέ τι τῶν μέμνηται, ὃ οἱ μάλα πολλάκις υἱὸν  
 τειρόμενον σώεσκον ὑπ' Εὐρυσθήος ἀέθλων.  
 ἦτοι ὁ μὲν κλαίεσκε πρὸς οὐρανόν, αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ Ζεὺς  
 τῷ ἐπαλεξήσουσαν ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν προΐαλλεν.  
 εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ τάδε ἦδε ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσιν  
 εὖτέ μιν εἰς Αἴδαο πυλάρταο προὔπεμψεν  
 ἐξ Ἑρέβους ἄξοντα κύνα στυγεροῦ Αἴδαο,  
 οὐκ ἂν ὑπεξέφυγε Στυγὸς ὕδατος αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα.

Athena recalls how frequently she stood by Heracles' side: the emphatic adverb *μάλα* *πολλάκις* and the pair of iterative verbs (*σώεσκον*, 8.363; *κλαίεσκε*, 8.364) combine to render Zeus' ingratitude all the more alarming. But the emphasis on frequency also highlights how traditional an element this is of Heracles' *fabula*: Athena's patronage of the hero and his labours are attested throughout archaic Greek epic,<sup>36</sup> while the specific exploit she recalls here, the theft of the dog Cerberus from the Underworld, was also traditional at an early date (*Od.*11.623-26, *Hes.Theog.*310-12).<sup>37</sup> When Athena recalls this episode, therefore, she refers to an episode that

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Nilsson (1932) 199; Lang (1983) 149-50; Cairns (2001a) 36. Formulaic system: Burkert (1979) 177n.4. Some scholars reconstruct specific (oral or written) poems on Heracles as the source of these allusions (e.g. Müller (1910) 117-41; Kullmann (1956b) 25-35; Sbardella (1994); West (2003b) 19-20, (2018)), but I shall stick here with traditions and *fabulae*.

<sup>35</sup> Heracles epics: Huxley (1969) 99-112.

<sup>36</sup> Athena's patronage: *Il.*20.145-48; *Od.*11.626; *Hes.Theog.*313-18; *Hes.Cat.*fr.33; Peisander fr.7 GEF. Labours: *Il.*8.363, 15.30, 19.133; *Od.*11.622, 624; *Hes.Theog.*951, fr.190.12, fr.248.

<sup>37</sup> Note esp. ἐξ Ἑρέβους ἄξοντα (*Il.*8.368) ~ ἦγαγον ἐξ Αἴδαο (*Od.*11.625).

not only Zeus should remember, but also Homer's external audience, from frequent (πολλάκις) tellings.

The same is true of other divine recollections of this earlier generation. In the Iliadic theomachy, Poseidon complains that Apollo no longer remembers the woes that the pair endured in their year-long service to Laomedon (οὐδέ νυ τῶν περ ἰ μέμνηται, *Il.*21.441-42), referring to the story of Laomedon's deceit, which precipitated Heracles' campaign against Troy.<sup>38</sup> Earlier in the poem, meanwhile, Zeus accuses Hera of failing to remember when he hung her up in the air by her feet and bound her wrists with an unbreakable gold band as punishment for her treatment of Heracles (*Il.*15.18-33). Hera's enmity against the hero is a well-established feature of his myth (*Il.*19.95-133, *Hes.Theog.*313-18, 327-32), but Zeus' passing reference to Heracles' visit to Cos (Κόων δ' εὔ ναιομένην, 15.28) evokes a whole further episode of that hero's adventures, in which he almost lost his life against the the Meropes, the local inhabitants of the island.<sup>39</sup> Hera's hanging, meanwhile, fits into a larger tradition of the succession myth and potential threats to Zeus' rule, a major narrative thread that underlies the *Iliad*.<sup>40</sup> In the first book of the poem, we have already heard of Hephaestus' punishment for attempting to help his mother in the past (ἤδη...ἄλλοτ', *Il.*1.590-94), as well as Achilles' instruction to his mother Thetis to remind Zeus (μνήσασα, *Il.*1.407) of the time when she freed him from the bonds devised by the other Olympians, a story that he has 'often heard' her tell before (πολλάκι...ἄκουσα, *Il.*1.396).<sup>41</sup> When Zeus frames his criticism of Hera with references to memory (ἤ οὐ μέμνη, 15.18; τῶν σ' αὖτις μνήσω, 15.31), Homer thus nods to tradition

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *Il.*5.638-51, 7.451-53, 20.145-48; Hellanicus fr.26 *EGM*; Moran (1975) 202-3; West (2011a) 32. As Currie (2016) 141n.188 notes, 'the article, τὸ κήτος (*Il.*20.147), implies a familiar episode.' On parallels between the first and second sacking of Troy: Anderson (1997) 92-97. The myth reinforces the impression of Trojan culpability: Allan (2006) 6.

<sup>39</sup> Apollod.*Bibl.*2.7.1; Plut.*Mor.*304c-e; Janko (1992) 191-92; Yasumura (2011) 49-51. The myth is also presupposed at *Il.*2.676-79, *HhAp.*42, *Hes.Cat.*fr.43a.55-65 (cf. Pind.*Nem.*4.25-27, *Isth.*6.31-34), and the archaic *Meropis* (P.Köln III 126, *SH* 903A: Lloyd-Jones (1984); Henrichs (1993) 187-95).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Slatkin (1991), Yasumura (2011) 39-57.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Moran (1975) 205 with n.24; Slatkin (1991) 60-62, with n.6.

once more: not only the *fabula* of Heracles, but also the wider myth of divine discord and past threats to Zeus' dominion.

In all these cases, therefore, characters' recollection of their past coincides with and precipitates the audience's own recall of the same episodes from the larger mythical and literary tradition. Through such acts of recall, the poet maps out the larger contours of myth, against which he situates his own poem. Through such an encyclopaedic vista, he frequently gestures to earlier moments that act as models or doublets for the present myth, including Achilles and Aeneas' previous encounter, Orestes' revenge and Heracles' sack of Troy. These recollections emphasise the inter-connected strands of myth.

### III.2.2 Intratextual Memories

In all of these foregoing cases, we have been dealing with an inevitable degree of speculation, reliant on the usual Neoanalytical method of reconstructing potential pre-Homeric traditions from internal or post-Homeric evidence. Many of our examples seem very plausible, but given the state of our evidence, absolute certainty is impossible. Nevertheless, these cases of intertextual 'poetic memory' in Homer are supported by instances where memory and knowledge function similarly to index intratextual connections within each poem. Most striking of all is another divine recollection in the Iliadic theomachy. Ares asks Athena whether she remembers the time when she supported Diomedes as he fought against the war-god (Il.21.394-99):

τίπτ' αὖτ' ὦ κυνάμυια θεοὺς ἔριδι ξυνελαύνεις  
θάρσος ἄητον ἔχουσα, μέγας δέ σε θυμὸς ἀνῆκεν;  
ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε Τυδεΐδην Διομήδε' ἀνῆκας  
οὐτάμεναι, αὐτὴ δὲ πανόψιον ἔγχος ἐλοῦσα  
ἰθὺς ἐμεῦ ὥσας, διὰ δὲ χροά καλὸν ἔδαψας;  
τὼ σ' αὖ νῦν ὀῖω ἀποτισέμεν ὅσσα ἔοργας.

With a formula which we have repeatedly encountered as an index of intertextual connections beyond both Homeric poems (ἢ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε), Ares invites Athena (and the audience) to ‘recall’ an episode from earlier within the very same poem: Diomedes’ *aristeia* in *Iliad* 5.<sup>42</sup> In that episode, Diomedes had been advised by Athena only to fight Aphrodite among the immortals (*Il.*5.124-32), an injunction which he claimed he was still mindful of when later reproached by the same goddess (μέμνημαι, *Il.*5.818). Despite his recollection of these instructions, however, both he and Athena soon disregarded them as Diomedes went on to attack Ares, the god of war himself, and wounded him with the help of Athena (*Il.*5.855-59):

δεύτερος αὖθ' ὤρματο βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης  
 ἔγχεϊ χαλκείῳ· ἐπέρεισε δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη  
 νείατον ἐς κενεῶνα ὅθι ζωννύσκετο μίτρη·  
 τῇ ῥά μιν οὐτὰ τυχών, διὰ δὲ χροά καλὸν ἔδαψεν,  
 ἐκ δὲ δόρυ σπάσεν αὖτις·

In *Iliad* 21, Ares explicitly invites Athena to recall this episode. The recollection is reinforced verbally by the repetition of οὐτὰ (*Il.*5.858) in οὐτάμεναι (*Il.*21.396) as well as the more pointed repetition of the whole phrase διὰ δὲ χροά καλὸν ἔδαψεν/ἔδαψας (*Il.*5.858 ~ *Il.*21.398), an expression which is found nowhere else in extant Greek literature.<sup>43</sup> The uniqueness of the phrase suggests that we could even treat it as a direct quotation of the earlier scene, or at least a quotation from a specific and recognisable *fabula* of Diomedes’ theomachic *hybris*. After all, the frequency with which later writers refer to the ‘*Aristeia* of Diomedes’ as an independent and recognisable part of the epic suggests that it would have been a self-standing and familiar episode of tradition.<sup>44</sup> This intratextual example, in which we can actively point to the incident recalled, lends strength to other cases noted above where we no longer have an early epic treatment of the episode in question. Events both beyond and within the poem are ‘recalled’ in the same manner, suggesting the continuum of larger mythological traditions. Specifically

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Moran (1975) 202; Andersen (1990) 26; Richardson (1993) 88; Currie (2016) 140.

<sup>43</sup> On further thematic parallels between these scenes: Richardson (1993) 10.

<sup>44</sup> E.g. ἐν Διομήδεος ἀριστείῃ, *Hdt.*2.116 (~ *Il.*6.289-92); ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διομήδους ἀριστείᾳ, Σ *Il.*8.385-7a1 (~ *Il.*5.734-36); καὶ τῇ Διομήδους ἀριστείᾳ, Σ *Il.*11.90-8 (~ *Il.*5.159-64); Διομήδους ἀριστεία, *Eust.**Il.*511.8 = *Il.*1.2 VdV.

‘Iliadic’ events are treated no differently than those belonging to other parts of the Trojan war tradition. All episodes are conceived as different paths, οἶμαι, within the larger network of song.<sup>45</sup>

Indeed, this conclusion can be strengthened by numerous other back-references within individual poems, which are similarly flagged through the language of memory and knowledge, tying the threads of the narrative together. In the *Iliad*, Diomedes’ charioteer Sthenelus does not forget the instructions he had received from Diomedes a short while earlier to steal Aeneas’ horses (οὐδ’ υἱὸς Καπανῆος ἐλήθετο συνθεσιάων, *Il*.5.319 ~ *Il*.5.259-73), while in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus *does* forget Circe’s advice that Scylla cannot be fought or defended against and vainly arms against her (λανθανόμεν, *Od*.12.226-27 ~ *Od*.12.119-20). In *Iliad* 9, meanwhile, Diomedes remarks that ‘the young and old of the Argives **know** all this’, that he was earlier rebuked by Agamemnon (ταῦτα δὲ πάντα | ἴσασ’ Ἀργείων ἡμὲν νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες, *Il*.9.35-36), a back-reference to ‘Agamemnon’s ill-judged censure’ of Tydeus’ son in *Iliad* 4 (*Il*.4.368-400).<sup>46</sup> Notably here, Diomedes marks this intratextual knowledge as familiar to the whole community through the totalising polar expression ‘young and old’.<sup>47</sup> It is knowledge shared by everyone, not only Diomedes’ internal audience, but also Homer’s external one. Such intratextual links connect small chains of narrative together, inviting audiences to recall recent episodes in the plot and more clearly follow their development.<sup>48</sup>

At times, this intratextual function of memory even appears to draw self-conscious attention to the structuring of the narrative itself. At the start of *Odyssey* 5, for example, Athena ‘remembers’ the many woes of Odysseus (μνησαμένη *Od*.5.6) and bemoans how nobody any longer remembers him (οὐ τις μέμνηται *Od*.5.11-12), repeating the words of Mentor at *Od*.2.233-34. Such a repeated emphasis on the failure to remember Odysseus in the poem’s

<sup>45</sup> For οἶμαι as ‘paths of song’: Thornton (1984) 148-49; Ford (1992) 41-43.

<sup>46</sup> Hainsworth (1993) 64; cf. Griffin (1995) 78-79.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Griffin (1995) 79.

<sup>48</sup> Also οὐ λήθετ’, *Il*.1.495 ~ *Il*.1.393-412; μνήσομαι, *Il*.9.647 ~ *Il*.1; μνησαμένοις’, *Od*.10.199 ~ *Od*.9.105-542, 10.81-132; μνησάμενοι, *Od*.12.309 ~ *Od*.12.245-59. Cf. Gaetano (2016) on Herodotus’ use of ‘memory’ to guide his audience through the structure of his narrative.

opening books may self-consciously draw attention to the narrative delay of the ‘Telemachy’ that dominates *Odyssey* 1-4,<sup>49</sup> with its unexpected focus on Ithaca and Telemachus, rather than Odysseus. After these opening four books, it is indeed as if the poet and audience have themselves ‘forgotten’ the poem’s alleged protagonist.<sup>50</sup>

More significant, however, is the manner in which this indexical function of memory conveys the sense that events within each Homeric poem are already becoming traditional, joined to the larger map of tradition. In *Iliad* 1, for example, Achilles begins his summary of events to his mother by remarking, ‘**You know**. Why should I tell the tale to **you who know** all the details?’ (οἶσθα. τί ἦ τοι ταῦτα ἰδυίῃ πάντ’ ἀγορεύω; *Il.*1.365) – a question that not only marks Thetis’ privileged divine knowledge, but also self-consciously acknowledges the audience’s familiarity with his coming words; they have already heard the story that he is about to repeat (*Il.*1.6-349).<sup>51</sup> At points, characters even consider the future recall of their contemporary events, looking ahead to the reception of Homeric song: when Agamemnon tells Achilles that ‘long will the Achaeans, I think, **remember** the strife between me and you’ (Ἀχαιοὺς | δηρὸν ἐμῆς καὶ σῆς ἔριδος μνήσεσθαι οἶω, *Il.*19.63-64), he lays implicit claim to the preservation of the *Iliad* itself, with its opening topic of the quarrel between the two warriors (ἐρίσαντε, *Il.*1.6).<sup>52</sup> Similarly, Hector claims that the Greeks will ‘**remember**’ the consuming fires around their ships (μνημοσύνη, *Il.*8.181), implicitly pointing to the immortalising power of Homer’s own narrative to preserve and commemorate this significant turning point in the narrative.<sup>53</sup> In the *Odyssey*, meanwhile, Odysseus suspects that ‘these dangers, too, I think, we shall someday **remember**’ (μνήσεσθαι, *Od.*12.212) – a claim that

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Σ *Od.*1.284d: ‘Since the *Odyssey* does not have sufficient variety in itself, the poet makes Telemachus go to Sparta and Pylos so that much *Iliadic* material may be mentioned in passing [ἐν παρεκβάσει].’

<sup>50</sup> For a similar ‘narrative wink’ of a character’s absence, cf. Kozak (2017) 47 on *Il.*5.472-76.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. de Jong (1985) 11, comparing Odysseus’ words at *Od.*12.450-54: τί τοι τάδε μυθολογεύω; ἦδη γὰρ τοι...ἐμυθεόμην (~ *Od.*7.241-97; Heubeck (1989) 143).

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Moran (1975) 209.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Nagy (1979) 17 §3n.2, who notes that this memorialisation is effectively achieved when the narrator later invokes the Muses to tell how fire first came upon the Greeks’ ships (*Il.*16.112-13).



could equally highlight the future poetic fame of his Apologoi, just as the Phaeacians' repeated appeals that Odysseus '**remember**' them might point to their preservation in song (Alcinous: **μειμνημένος**, *Od.*8.244; Arete: **μειμνημένος**, *Od.*8.431; Nausicaa: **μνήση**, *Od.*8.462). Poetic memory, therefore, is not only about gesturing to other traditions and poems which the poet subsumes within his own work, but also a means for Homer to mark out his own place in this tradition – carving out his own space and claiming that future generations too will remember the events that he narrates, just as he and his characters remember other events of the mythical past.

### III.2.3 Selective Recall

In many of the cases that we have explored above, indexical memory gestures to a wider canon of myth, incorporating broader traditions and details that reflect on the present poem. These signposts often introduce allusions that seem less agonistic than many of the instances of indexical hearsay that we have explored before. But indexical memory is not entirely free from agonistic posturing. We have already noted the competitive aspect in characters' challenges to their addressee's memories, revealing an anxiety in the fallibility of individuals' powers of recall. But beyond this, we can highlight cases of indexical recall which introduce a selective and partial reshaping of tradition. We shall explore two such cases here, one from the *Iliad* and one from the *Odyssey*. Appeal to memory authorises departure from tradition, while also inviting audience members to supply what is left untold from their own knowledge.

The first passage comes from *Odyssey* 24, when Agamemnon's shade addresses the newly deceased Amphimedon's ghost. After recognising the suitor and inquiring how he died, Agamemnon appeals to their former *xenia* and asks whether he remembers the time when the Atreidae came to Ithaca to recruit Odysseus for the expedition against Troy, employing the same introductory phrase that we have seen repeatedly before (*Od.*24.115-19):

ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε κείσε κατήλυθον ὑμέτερον δῶ,

ὄτρυνέων Ὀδυσῆα σὺν ἀντιθέῳ Μενελάῳ  
 Ἴλιον εἰς ἅμ' ἔπεσθαι ἐϋσσέλμων ἐπὶ νηῶν;  
 μηνὶ δ' ἄρ' οὐλῶ πάντα περήσαμεν εὐρέα πόντον,  
 σπουδῇ παρπεπιθόντες Ὀδυσσῆα πτολίπορθον.

Agamemnon's question evokes the traditions surrounding the mustering of Greek troops for the Trojan expedition, an episode which Amphimedon does indeed remember (μέμνημαι τάδε πάντα, *Od.*24.122).<sup>54</sup> Like Achilles' 'great foray', these events were also treated in the *Cypria* (*Cypr.*arg.5) and alluded to in the *Iliad*, where Achilles' recruitment by Nestor and Odysseus is twice mentioned (*Il.*9.252-59, 11.765-90). Agamemnon's question here, however, emphasises the specific difficulties involved in recruiting Odysseus, who seems to have shown some reluctance: the whole expedition to win him over took a whole month (μηνὶ...οὐλῶ, 24.118), Odysseus was only persuaded with difficulty (σπουδῇ, 24.119) and deceit (παρπεπιθόντες, 24.119),<sup>55</sup> while the Atreidae had to stay at Amphimedon's house, rather than at Odysseus' own, suggesting some friction in their relationship (24.115).<sup>56</sup> As scholars have noted, this emphasis on Odysseus' reluctance seems to hint at a specific tradition of Odysseus' unwillingness to join the Trojan expedition, an episode also familiar to us from the *Cypria*.<sup>57</sup> In that poem, according to Proclus' summary, Odysseus refused to join the mission and even feigned madness to avoid it, only to be tricked by Palamedes into revealing his sanity when the life of his son Telemachus was threatened (*Cypr.*arg.5b). The reason for this reluctance was apparently a prophecy by the seer Halitherses, indicating that Odysseus would not return from Troy until the twentieth year (*Od.*2.170-76).<sup>58</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Moran (1975) 206-7 notes that this expression also initiates Amphimedon's distorted account of the suitors' death (*Od.*24.123-90), indexically marking his summary 'recollection' of the *Odyssey*.

<sup>55</sup> See LSJ s.v. παρπαίθω, 'freq. with notion of deceit or guile'. Both other Odyssean uses of the verb (*Od.*14.290, 22.213) bear this negative association: Danek (1998) 477.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Sammons (2017) 88. Contrast the cooperation and elaborate hospitality that Nestor and Odysseus encounter in Peleus' house (*Il.*11.765-90).

<sup>57</sup> Stanford (1963) 83; Moran (1975) 206-7; Danek (1998) 476-78; Tsagalis (2012) 328-30; Currie (2015) 288, (2016) 141.

<sup>58</sup> On the myth: Jouan (1966) 339-363; Gantz (1996) 580; Griffith (2013). From later accounts, we hear that Odysseus attempted to avoid the war by donning the head-gear of a sick man, yoking two incompatible animals to his

The figure of Palamedes is, of course, notably absent from the *Odyssey*, which could suggest that this tale is simply a post-Homeric invention, and perhaps even an embellished extrapolation from this very passage.<sup>59</sup> However, aspects of Palamedes' character suggest a figure of considerable antiquity,<sup>60</sup> and one can easily understand why Homer would have muted his presence in the poem: as another figure of cunning and guile who had outwitted even Odysseus, he would be a rival claimant to the title of πολύμητις ἀνὴρ. In addition, any mention of Odysseus' vengeful and deceitful murder of Palamedes (*Cypr.arg.12b, fr.27*) would considerably impair our estimation of the poem's protagonist. Palamedes' absence is thus, in all likelihood, a pointed case of Homeric exclusion.<sup>61</sup> Agamemnon's memory of the incident, like Homer's own, is pointedly selective.

Regardless of Palamedes' involvement, however, the traditionality of Odysseus' feigned madness is reinforced by the fact that it reflects a facet of Odysseus' character that is already well-established in Homer: his devotion to his family.<sup>62</sup> On several occasions in the *Iliad*, Odysseus describes himself as the 'father of Telemachus' (Τηλεμάχοιο πατήρ, *Il.2.260*, Τηλεμάχοιο φίλον πατέρα, 4.354), uniquely defining himself in terms of his son, rather than the usual heroic practice of one's father.<sup>63</sup> This same concern with family is at the heart of the

---

plough (an ox and a horse/ass) and sowing his fields with salt. Palamedes unmasked the trick either by placing Telemachus before the plough (*Hyg.Fab.95*; Serv. *ad Aen.2.81*; Σ *Lycoph.Alex.815a*, Tzetz. *ad Alex.384-86, 818*) or by threatening the infant with a sword (*Apollod.Epit.3.7*; Lucian, *De Domof* 30), as Telephus did Orestes (*Eur.test.vb TrGF*; *Ar.Thesm.695-764*).

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Strabo 8.6.2; Stanford (1963) 82-84. Clua (1985) 74-75n.14 catalogues various views on this Homeric silence.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Phillips (1957); Kakridis (1995). Gerhard (1867) V.30-31 sees evidence of pre-Homeric tradition in an Etruscan mirror that depicts Ajax, Menelaus, Palamedes and Diomedes (in preparation for the recruitment of Odysseus?); cf. Christopoulos (2014) 155n.3 (correcting the table reference to CCCLXXXII,2).

<sup>61</sup> Thus Philostr.V.A.4.16; Kullmann (1960) 165-66; Szarmach (1974); Danek (1998) 139, 237; Schlange-Schöningen (2006).

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Borthwick (1985) 9-11.

<sup>63</sup> A scholiast apparently took at least one of these phrases as a self-conscious pre-figuring of the *Odyssey* (προοικονομεῖ δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν, Σ *Il.2.260a*; cf. Lentini (2006) 19-92), but given the more general and traditional association of Odysseus and Telemachus (as visible in the recruitment episode), a direct foreshadowing of the *Odyssey* is by no means certain.

recruitment episode, in which Odysseus not only tries to stay at home, but also abandons his ruse to save his son. Both these Iliadic scenes, moreover, can be seen to evoke the context of Odysseus' maddened ploughing: in Book 2, Odysseus goes on to claim that any man becomes impatient who is parted from his wife even for a single month (ἐνα μῆνα, *Il.*2.292-93), a sentiment which parallels his initial reluctance to go to the war, especially if 'one month' was the traditional duration of his delay (μηνὶ...οὐλω, *Od.*24.118). In Book 4, meanwhile, he has just been rebuked by Agamemnon for not entering the battle more quickly (*Il.*4.336-48), just as he shirked from battle on Ithaca. As Scodel remarks, by mentioning his son in this context, the poet again 'links Telemachus with a question of whether Odysseus is eager to fight.'<sup>64</sup> Although, as ever, certainty is impossible given our limited evidence, it is likely that the tradition of Odysseus' reluctance and Palamedes' resolution of the impasse pre-dated the *Odyssey*. After all, we know from the Hesiodic *Catalogue* that Odysseus was not bound to participate in the Trojan war by the oath of Tyndareus, unlike Helen's former suitors (*Hes.fr.*204.68-84); he thus had more reason to avoid participation than most.

By alluding to the episode through the language of memory, therefore, Agamemnon once more indexes the recollection of another episode from the larger Trojan war tradition. In this case, however, we may also have a case of partial *misremembering*, and not just because of Palamedes' omission. As we have seen above, the Homeric epics tread a fine line between the opposite poles of memory and oblivion and any act of memory is always liable to be partial, gradually eroded by the passage of time. In the case of this episode, it is worth noting that, outside the Odyssean underworld (here and *Od.*11.447-48), Agamemnon is not known to have featured in other early versions of the embassy to Odysseus. According to Proclus (*Cypr.arg.*5b), the embassy in the *Cypria* comprised Menelaus, Nestor and Palamedes,<sup>65</sup> while in Apollodorus' *Epitome*, Agamemnon is said to have sent a herald to each king, avoiding the dirty work of negotiation himself (*Epit.*3.6). Judging by other Iliadic scenes, such delegation was his usual *modus operandi*: he sent the heralds Talthibius and Eurybates to take Briseis from

<sup>64</sup> Scodel (2002) 15-16, noting the aptness of Telemachus' name here: 'fighting at a distance'.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Heubeck (1992) 372-73; West (2013) 102, (2014a) 299n.244.

Achilles (*Il.*1.318-48), dispatched Phoenix, Ajax and Odysseus to speak on his behalf in the embassy to Achilles (*Il.*9), and delegated the initial pre-war recruitment of Achilles to Nestor and Odysseus (*Il.*9.252-59, 11.765-90).<sup>66</sup> Later in Apollodorus' *Epitome*, meanwhile, it is Menelaus, Odysseus and Talthymbius who go to Cyprus to recruit Cinyras, the local king who offers a gift of breastplates to the pointedly 'absent' Agamemnon (Ἀγαμέμνονι...οὐ παρόντι, *Epit.*3.9; cf. *Il.*11.20-23 for this gift). In the case of Odysseus' recruitment too, it is thus likely that Agamemnon did not traditionally play a direct role.<sup>67</sup> Agamemnon's 'recollection' here, therefore, appears to rewrite tradition, effacing any memory of Palamedes and substituting Agamemnon in his place.<sup>68</sup>

For an audience versed in tradition, however, Agamemnon's indexical appeal to memory would encourage recollection of this suppressed detail. Just as Agenor's indexical **φασί** effaces the tradition of Achilles' immortality in the *Iliad* (*Il.*21.569, §II.2.2: 67-70), so too does Agamemnon's reminiscence conceal Palamedes' role in a cloud of forgetfulness, subtly acknowledging the *Odyssey's* partisan presentation of events. The appeal to memory invites audiences to recall this omitted detail and acknowledge Homer's more positive presentation of Odysseus. Memory, therefore, just like hearsay, not only marks allusive references, but also

<sup>66</sup> In the *Cypria*, Odysseus, Phoenix and Nestor recruited Achilles (*Cypr.*fr.19). Agamemnon's art of delegation is not restricted to diplomacy: Achilles complains that he similarly does nothing in battle but retains the lion's share of booty (*Il.*1.158-68, 9.328-33). On Agamemnon's characterisation: Taplin (1990); Porter (2018).

<sup>67</sup> Our only other evidence for Agamemnon's involvement comes in several late sources which were presumably influenced by the *Odyssey*: Hyg.*Fab.*95; Quint.*Smyrn.*5.191-94 (the indexical use of memory reinforces the likely connection with Homer's own 'recollection': ἡ ἐπὶ τόδ' ἐξελάθου, ὅτ', 5.191. For such a chain of indexical memory, cf. Virg.*Ecl.*9.52 (*memini*) ~ Callim.*Epigr.*2 (ἐμνήσθην) ~ Heraclitus 1.8 HE (μναμόσυνον)). Contrast Palamedes in Accius, *Ajax* 109-14 (= Cic.*Off.*3.26.98); Ov.*Met.*13.34-42; Σ Soph.*Phil.*1025; Serv. *ad Aen.*2.81; Σ Stat.*Achil.*1.93-94; Tzet. *ad Lycoph.Alex.*384-86, 818; Lucian, *De Domo* 30; Philostr.*Her.*33.4; Myth.*Vat.*I.35; Myth.*Vat.*II.200. Compare the competing traditions as to whether Agamemnon took Briseis in person or through heralds, evidenced in both the *Iliad* and vase painting: Lowenstam (1997) 39-44; Dué (2002) 28-30.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Heubeck (1992) 372, who also suspects that the guest-friendship between Agamemnon and Amphimedon's father, Melaneus, is a Homeric invention; cf. Jones (1992) 78-9. This example of selective memory would support Gazis' case for a distinctive 'Poetics of Hades' (2018), in which the Underworld fosters alternative and partisan accounts of the epic past.

signposts particularly contentious points of tradition, inviting audiences to recall other, competing versions.

A similarly selective treatment of the mythical past is visible in the *Iliad*. As the Greek army start disbanding in response to Agamemnon's 'testing' speech in *Iliad* 2, Odysseus rallies them by recalling an event from before the start of the war (*Il.*2.299-304):

τλήτε, φίλοι, καὶ μείνατ' ἐπὶ χρόνον, ὄφρα δαῶμεν  
ἢ ἔτεον Κάλχας μαντεύεται, ἥε καὶ οὐκί.  
εὖ γὰρ δὴ τόδε ἴδμεν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἐστὲ δὲ πάντες  
**μάρτυροι**, οὓς μὴ κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτοιο φέρουσαι  
**χθιζά τε καὶ πρωίξ', ὅτ'** ἐς Αὐλίδα νῆες Ἀχαιῶν  
ἠγερέθοντο κακὰ Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρῳσὶ φέρουσαι

He goes on to recall an omen that they witnessed while sacrificing to the gods at Aulis: a terrible blood-red-backed snake appeared near the altar and devoured eight sparrow chicks alongside their mother, before disappearing or being turned to stone (*Il.*2.305-20).<sup>69</sup> Calchas immediately interpreted this omen to mean that the Greeks would sack Troy in the tenth year of the war, a prophecy that Odysseus recalls now to stop the Achaeans disbanding the war effort on the cusp of victory (*Il.*2.321-32). As scholars have long recognised, this event appears to have been a well-established feature of the pre-war tradition.<sup>70</sup> Like many of the episodes we have discussed above, it was treated in the *Cypria* (*Cypr.*arg.6). And already in *Iliad* 1, the importance and traditionality of Calchas' pre-war prophecies have been suggested by his introduction as the man who guided the Greek ships to Troy with his art of prophecy (*Il.*1.71-72) and Agamemnon's scathing criticism of his ever unfavourable prophecies (*Il.*1.106-8).<sup>71</sup> By introducing his account of Aulis as something which he and his audience have witnessed

<sup>69</sup> On the authenticity of 2.319 and the disputed reading of 2.318 (ἀρίζηλον, 'conspicuous' or ἀίζηλον, 'invisible'): Kirk (1985) 149-50; West (2011a) 108; Hunter (2018) 143-44.

<sup>70</sup> Kullmann (1960) 263; West (2011a) 32-33. Verzina (2014) n.47 further argues that the eight-year time frame may be 'a residual feature of an ancient motif'. Later accounts closely follow that of Homer and the *Cypria*: Apollod.*Epit.*3.15, Ov.*Met.*12.11-23, Cic.*Div.*2.30.63-65. Ovid's *vetus...ara* (*Met.*12.12) indexically acknowledges the antiquity of Homer's version (cf. Musgrove (1997) 276-78).

<sup>71</sup> For the possible allusion to Iphigenia's sacrifice at Aulis: §IV.2.1: 195.

(μάρτυροι) and know (ἴδμεν), Odysseus reinforces the sense that this is indeed a familiar and traditional episode,<sup>72</sup> an impression strengthened by a string of further indexical markers: the temporal phrase *χθιζά τε καὶ πρωίζ' ὅτε* (*Il.*2.303) marks the event as fresh in the Greeks' memories ('it seems just like yesterday'),<sup>73</sup> while Calchas goes on to predict that the fame of this omen will never die (κλέος οὐ ποτ' ὀλεῖται, *Il.*2.325), a phrase that not only self-referentially marks the *Iliad*'s role in preserving that κλέος,<sup>74</sup> but also the fame and reputation that the tale has already acquired in tradition. Indeed, by recalling events on Aulis, the poet paves the way for the subsequent Catalogue of Ships (*Il.*2.494-779), a passage which evokes the initial mustering of the Greek contingent at Aulis.<sup>75</sup>

There is one detail, however, that complicates the simplicity of Odysseus' appeal to knowledge. According to Proclus' summary of the *Cypria*, this snake and sparrow portent took place many years before the Greeks even reached Troy, during the army's first gathering at Aulis. Rather than immediately reaching Troy after this mustering, they mistakenly landed in Mysia, attacked Telephus and his men, and returned home after being scattered by a storm (*Cypr.arg.*7).<sup>76</sup> Proclus does not specify the time frame of this first abortive 'Teuthranian' expedition, but according to Apollodorus, it added an extra ten years to the whole expedition: the Greeks set out to Mysia in the second year after Helen's rape, and only gathered again in Aulis eight years later, where they were helped by Telephus' local knowledge to reach Troy (*Apollod.Epit.*3.18-20). Scholars have long debated whether these events are presupposed by the *Iliad*.<sup>77</sup> Their details seem to have been well-established at an early date: Telephus is mentioned in passing as the father of Eurypylos in the *Odyssey* (*Od.*11.519-20), his birth and flight from the Greeks are narrated in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (*Hes.fr.*165), and his encounter

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Currie (2016) 142; Hunter (2018) 140. For μάρτυροι, cf. Callim.fr.612: ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω.

<sup>73</sup> Kirk (1985) 148.

<sup>74</sup> Taplin (1992) 88; cf. Nagy (2003) 25-27, (2009) 74-105.

<sup>75</sup> West (2011a) 32-33, 111-13. Significantly, Aulis is one of the very first places named in the catalogue (*Il.*2.496).

<sup>76</sup> For this expedition as a doublet of the Trojan War: Currie (2015) 290.

<sup>77</sup> *Iliad* presupposing: Kullmann (1960) 189-203, (2012) 15-20; Currie (2015) 289. Contrast: Σ *Il.*1.59c-d; Page (1961) 207-8; Hölscher (1966) 120-21.

with Achilles appears to have been treated in the *Little Iliad* (*Il.Parv.fr.4*). In recent years, moreover, Archilochus' Telephus elegy (fr.17a) has added further evidence that the myth was a familiar part of the epic tradition by at least the seventh century.<sup>78</sup> Yet the *Iliad* is conspicuously silent on this episode: it makes no direct mention of Telephus, and it is Calchas – not Telephus – who is said to have guided the ships to Troy through his own art of divination (*Il.1.71-72*).<sup>79</sup> In the *Odyssey*, moreover, these extra ten years are incompatible with the poem's internal time-frame, in which Odysseus returns to Ithaca after twenty years, ten spent wandering and ten at Troy. Even so, however, there is one detail in the *Iliad* that seems to presuppose the Teuthranian expedition: Helen's complaint that she has now been in Troy for twenty years (ἔεικοστόν ἔτος, *Il.24.765-66*), a total that is difficult to explain without presupposing the additional ten-year delay in Mysia (λέγεται τὸν πόλεμον εἰκοσαετῇ γενέσθαι, *Epit.3.18*).<sup>80</sup> It is only a small hint, but it is enough to suggest that the audience of the *Iliad* could have been aware of the Teuthranian campaign.<sup>81</sup>

In that case, we should ask how this larger tradition affects our interpretation of Odysseus' recall of Calchas' prophecy in *Iliad* 2. With the knowledge of hindsight, it seems that Calchas' calculation only determined how long the Greeks would spend in Troy once they had actually arrived there, but this was not the only possible way of interpreting his words. Like

---

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Kullmann (2012) 16.

<sup>79</sup> νῆεσς ἡγήσατ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἴλιον εἶσω, *Il.1.71*. Contrast: ὥς ἡγεμόνα γενησόμενον τοῦ ἐπ' Ἴλιον πολῦ, *Cypr.arg.7d*. However, these versions are not necessarily mutually exclusive: in Apollodorus' *Epitome*, Telephus shows the course to steer, and Calchas confirms the accuracy of his information through his art of divination (*Epit.3.20*).

<sup>80</sup> Thus Kullmann (1960) 192-93; cf. Σ *Il.9.668b*; contrast: Σ *Il.19.326a1*. I find Kullmann's argument more plausible than those who take 'twenty' simply as 'an intensification of ten' or 'equivalent to any large number' (Macleod (1982) 154; Richardson (1993) 358), as taking account of the time it took to muster the troops in the first place (Macleod (1982) 154); or as a polemical usurpation of a distinctively Odyssean time-frame (*Od.19.222-23, 24.321-23*; Tsagalis (2008) 135-149; cf. Reinhardt (1961) 485-90; Hooker (1986)).

<sup>81</sup> Kullmann (1960) 195-96 further suggests that the combination of πάλιν- and ἄψ in *Il.1.59-60* (reading πάλιν πλαγχθέντας instead of παλιμπλαγχθέντας) might presuppose a former return, that from Mysia: this is attractive, although not the most natural interpretation of the Greek.



many ancient oracles and prophecies, Calchas' speech is misleading and ambiguous. The crucial word is the adverb αὖθι (ὥς ἡμεῖς τοσσαῦτ' ἔτεα πτολεμίζομεν αὖθι, *Il.*2.328): taken with its locative meaning ('there'), it indicates that the Greeks will fight for ten years in Troy, and so is fully compatible with the Teuthranian expedition before that time. However, if we foreground its temporal meaning ('forthwith/immediately'), the prophecy tells that the Greeks will fight for ten years from the moment of the portent, a time-frame that leaves no space for the Teuthranian campaign. Within the immediate context of *Iliad* 2, however, evoking a prophecy that preceded a failed and lengthy expedition is not especially auspicious. Indeed, as Hunter has remarked, if 'the audience of the *Iliad* were aware that this portent was elsewhere connected with an abortive first Trojan expedition, then this can only have increased a sense that Odysseus was manipulating "the facts" for rhetorical effect.'<sup>82</sup> Odysseus' evocation of knowledge, like Agamemnon's of memory, is pliable and selective. He avoids explicit mention of the many years of hardship endured even before they reached Troy, but in evoking the communal knowledge of his Greek audience, he invites Homer's external audience to recall this other episode, with all its additional baggage.

### III.2.4 Proleptic Knowledge

Mortal characters' repeated references to memory, knowledge and forgetting thus had a strong indexical potential in both Homeric poems, triggering an audience's recall of other episodes and moments of the larger tradition, even those that had been suppressed or pointedly reshaped. Before turning to the phenomenon in the wider epic tradition, however, it is worth dwelling on a distinctive aspect of indexical knowledge: the tendency for Homer's characters to exhibit knowledge which transcends the expected limits of their immediate circumstances, displaying an uncanny familiarity with events of the mythical future.

---

<sup>82</sup> Hunter (2018) 140n.10.

A simple example of this phenomenon occurs in *Iliad* 10. After Diomedes has chosen Odysseus to accompany him on his night mission, the Ithacan hero insists that Diomedes should not say too much about him, since ‘you are saying these words among Argives **who know** (εἰδόσι γάρ τοι ταῦτα μετ’ Ἀργείοις ἀγορεύεις, *Il.*10.250). As Alden has noted, ‘[w]hat Odysseus thinks the Argives know on this occasion is that joint action by himself and Diomede[s] is a common theme in the tradition, and that he also has a number of solo night missions to his credit’.<sup>83</sup> Indeed, shortly before this, Diomedes has asked how he could possibly ‘**forget**’ Odysseus as his ideal partner (πῶς ἄν...**λαθοίμην**, *Il.*10.243), making the very same point. What Alden does not acknowledge, however, is the fact that most of these collaborations and nocturnal missions are events that take place after the action of the *Iliad*. Their joint theft of the Palladium (*Il.Parv.arg.*4e) and wounding of Polyxena (*Cypr.fr.*34 PEG),<sup>84</sup> as well as Odysseus’ capture of Helenus (*Il.Parv.arg.*2a) and disguised expedition in Troy (*Il.Parv.arg.*4a-d, *Od.*4.240-58) all take place after the death and burial of Hector; only their joint slaying of Palamedes occurs earlier than the events of the *Iliad* (Paus.10.31.2, *Cypr.fr.*27).<sup>85</sup> Odysseus thus presents the Greeks as having an anachronistic knowledge of his expertise and companionship with Diomedes from previous tellings of the myth. Their knowledge becomes aligned with that of Homer’s audience.

Such proleptic knowledge is a recurring element of both Homeric poems. In the Odyssean *Nekyia*, the newly deceased Elpenor already ‘**knows**’ (οἶδα) what lies in store for Odysseus after his Underworld trip – that he will make a return visit to Circe on Aea before continuing his homeward voyage (*Od.*11.69-70). Such knowledge is strictly anachronistic – and

<sup>83</sup> Alden (2017) 10 with n.38; cf. Kullmann (1960) 86; Fenik (1964) 12-13; Nagy (1979) 34-35.

<sup>84</sup> West does not print this fragment in his edition because he follows older scholars in arguing that this episode (ascribed to τὰ κυπριακά) derives not from the epic *Cypria*, but from another source (a prose treatment of Cyprus?): West (2013) 55n.1, cf. Welcker (1865–82) II.164; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1884) 181n.27; Bethe (1966) 69n.5. But such variation in the poem’s title is common, and I follow those who attach this fragment to the *Cypria*: Bernabé (1987–2007) I.62, cf. I.38; Burgess (2001a) 242n.19, 252n.116.

<sup>85</sup> The pair have already worked closely together earlier in the *Iliad*: e.g. *Il.*5.519, 8.92-96. Both are also independently associated with the return of Philoctetes from Lemnos (*Il.Parv.arg.*2b; Apollod.*Epit.*3.27; Fenik (1964) 13n.2).

the first that Homer's audience has heard of this plot detail.<sup>86</sup> As with the Iliadic Argives' larger knowledge of Odysseus' and Diomedes' teamwork, so too here, Elpenor's knowledge derives from the larger tradition, or at least from an atemporal familiarity with the whole of the poem that is still in progress. In the *Iliad*, meanwhile, both Hector and Agamemnon, claim with unerring accuracy that they '**know full well**' that Troy will fall, an event that lies not only in their future, but even beyond the scope of their current poem (*Il*.4.163-65 = 6.447-49):

εὖ γὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε οἶδα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν·  
ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτ' ἄν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρὴ  
καὶ Πριάμος καὶ λαὸς ἐνυμελίῳ Πριάμοιο.

As scholars have noted, these repeated verses provide a complementary and contrasting insight into what Troy's fate means to both the Greeks and the Trojans, Agamemnon's assertive declaration serving as a foil for Hector's later pathetic acknowledgement.<sup>87</sup> But the knowledge they express here again transcends their usual mortal limits. Agamemnon could be referring back to the Aulis prophecy which Odysseus recalled several books earlier, but Hector, as far as we are aware, has not been privy to any such divine message. Moreover, it is striking that after these verses both speakers utter alternative visions of the future which contradict this confessed 'knowledge': Agamemnon goes on to fear that Menelaus will die and the expedition be abandoned in ignominy (*Il*.4.169-82), while Hector changes tune to pray that his son Astyanax may rule mightily over Troy and be deemed superior to his father, a source of continuing joy for his mother – an image incompatible with his previous vision of Troy's ruin (*Il*.6.476-81).<sup>88</sup> Their prophetic knowledge almost seems to be a quotation of the mythical tradition, of which they themselves in character remain uncertain.

<sup>86</sup> Heubeck (1989) 81.

<sup>87</sup> Kirk (1990) 220; Di Benedetto (1994) 184-87; Stoevesandt (2016) 160-61. On the *Iliad*'s allusions to Troy's fall more generally: Kullmann (1960) 343-49; Haft (1990) 39-40.

<sup>88</sup> Such vacillation of moods is 'characteristic of Homeric psychology': Griffin (1980) 72; Stoevesandt (2016) 64. And especially of Hector: Kullmann (2001) 397-99.

Even more striking than this prophecy of Troy's general doom, however, is Hector's dying prediction of Achilles' future death (*Il.*22.356-60):

ἦ σ' εὖ γινώσκων προτιόσσομαι, οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλον  
 πείσειν· ἦ γὰρ σοί γε σιδήρεος ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός.  
 φράζεο νῦν, μή τοί τι θεῶν μήνιμα γένωμαι  
 ἥματι τῷ ὅτε κέν σε Πάρις καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων  
 ἐσθλὸν ἐόντ' ὀλέσωσιν ἐνὶ Σκαίῃσι πύλῃσιν.”

Hector shows an intimate awareness of the details of Achilles' death, the clearest in the whole poem. Throughout the *Iliad*, we have received increasingly precise premonitions of Achilles' fate, especially from his own horse Xanthus (*Il.*19.416-17), and Achilles himself has admitted that he '**knows full well**' that he will die thanks to the insight of his divine mother Thetis (εὖ νυ τὸ οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς ὃ μοι μόρος ἐνθάδ' ὀλέσθαι, *Il.*19.421).<sup>89</sup> But Hector's remarks here transcend such a general awareness to specify the precise details of Achilles' fate: he will die at the hands of Paris and Apollo at the Scaean gates. Scholars often note that the dying were thought capable of supernaturally prophetic speech in antiquity, the same kind of precognition also displayed by Patroclus when he predicts Hector's impending demise at Achilles' hand (*Il.*16.852-54).<sup>90</sup> But it is striking that Hector here, despite his misreading of the future at other times in the poem,<sup>91</sup> matches the record of traditional mythology precisely.<sup>92</sup> In both the *Aethiopis* and later artistic depictions, it is both Paris and Apollo who are responsible for the hero's death (*Aeth.*arg.3a), while the Scaean gates are mentioned in the context of Peleus, Thetis and Achilles in a highly fragmentary papyrus ascribed to the Hesiodic *Catalogue*

<sup>89</sup> The recurring emphasis on fate further reinforces the traditionality of this coming death: it is demanded by tradition (μόρσιμον, 19.417; μόρος, 19.421; μοῖρα, 21.110).

<sup>90</sup> Σ *Il.*16.854a (citing Plat.*Ap.*39c); Duckworth (1933) 19; Janko (1992) 420; de Jong (2012) 149. Perhaps we should add Elpenor's exceptional foreknowledge to this category (*Od.*11.69-70).

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Currie (2016) 144, citing Andersen (1990): Hector is 'prone to be mistaken about things'.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Duckworth (1933) 32; Currie (2016) 144, further noting the breach of 'Jørgensen's law', the convention that Homer's mortal characters cannot usually name the specific deity who intervenes in human affairs: Jørgensen (1904).

(Hes.fr.212b.5).<sup>93</sup> Crucially, Hector prefaces this prediction by emphasising his own knowledge (γινώσκων), marking his privileged understanding of Achilles' whole *fabula*. His knowledge transcends what a character should logically know within the plot.

Besides evoking episodes of the mythical past like indexical memory, therefore, characters' declarations of knowledge can also have a proleptic edge, nodding forward to future events that reach beyond the strict confines of narrative logic. Such indexing of tradition is even more self-conscious than retrospective nods elsewhere, since it involves characters' familiarity with events of which they should strictly have no awareness. Characters' knowledge, therefore, can look both forwards and backwards to incorporate the whole story of the Trojan war.

### III.2.5 Mapping Epic Memory

As the foregoing examples have demonstrated, poetic memory was already a well-established feature of Homeric poetry. Characters' recollections and knowledge of other episodes in their own fictional world repeatedly map onto the recall of both earlier and later episodes from the epic tradition. Of course, not every mention of 'memory' will necessarily have such indexical potential. When characters 'recall' general nouns, such as 'battle', 'valour' and 'food', we would be hard pressed to interpret these indexically.<sup>94</sup> But whenever characters recall events or episodes (of the past or future), often alongside a temporal ὅτε, they always appear to refer to a familiar feature of myth.

---

<sup>93</sup> For the myth of Achilles' death and its sources, cf. Burgess (2009) 38-39, although he fails to mention the Hesiodic fragment. Later mentions of the Scaean gates: Quint.Smyrn.3.82, Apollod.Epit.5.3.

<sup>94</sup> E.g. χάρμης, *Il.*4.222; θούριδος ἀλκῆς, *Il.*6.112/*Od.*4.527; δόρπον, *Il.*24.601; φυλακῆς, *Il.*7.371 νόστου, *Il.*10.509; κοίτου, *Od.*16.481. Though even these could be interpreted as marking the resumption of traditional aspects of heroic life: fighting, feasting and sleeping are what these heroes are 'supposed' to be doing.

So far, however, we have avoided addressing a potential objection to many of these cases of indexical memory in Homer: the potentially formulaic nature of the language in which they are expressed. Many of the above examples have been introduced by a single recurring phrase, ἢ οὐ μέμνη/οἶσθ' ὅτε, while the close structural parallel between *Od.*1.29-31 and *Od.*4.187-89 might similarly suggest formulaic scaffolding. Even if such language is formulaic, however, this does not negate its indexical potential. Indeed, we could even argue that the traditional resonance of such phrasing lies precisely in its evocation of other stories and characters: traditionally, these phrases function as a longhand 'cf.' In the case of *Od.*1.29-31 and *Od.*4.187-89, too, we must stress that these are the only two places in Homer which combine the verbal forms μνήσατο and ἐπιμνησθείς, a fact which should make us hesitate before dismissing them as merely formulaic.<sup>95</sup> Most crucially, however, it is striking that in every instance where characters recollect other events, Homer is pointing to other familiar elements of tradition – it would be overly cynical to dismiss this as a complete coincidence and deny it any allusive significance. As with Ovid's Ariadne, all these cases of poetic memory forge a connection between the Homeric narrative and the larger epic tradition of which they form a part. Characters' recollections of their historical past coincide with and trigger the audience's recall of the very same events from the mythical tradition.

So far, we have focused almost entirely on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as rich sources for such cases of poetic memory. When we turn to the broader corpus of early Greek epic, by contrast, it is striking how few parallels we can find. In Hesiod's *Works and Days*, we only encounter repeated exhortations to Perses to 'remember' the instructions he has received (μνησθήσῃ, *Op.*298, 422, 616, 623, 641, 711, 728; cf. *HhAphr.*283: Aphrodite to Anchises), while in the *Theogony*, characters only remember a handful of events from within the narrative (the Cyclopes Zeus' favour, ἀπεμνήσαντο, *Theog.*503; Zeus Prometheus' deception, μνησθήσῃ,

---

<sup>95</sup> Rarity of repetition is often treated as a key indicator of a word or phrase's allusive potential: Bakker (2013) 157-69. Oralists have typically taken three instances as 'the minimum criterion of typicality': Fenik (1968) 5; Kelly (2007a) 10. In the rest of archaic Greek epic, ἐπιμνησθείς occurs nowhere else, and μνήσατο only once elsewhere (*HhDem.*283).

*Theog.*562; and the Hundred-Handers their friendship with Zeus, *μνησάμενοι*, *Theog.*651). The best non-Homeric example we can perhaps find is in the seventh *Homeric Hymn* (to Dionysus), which does not launch into its narrative with the usual hymnic relative clause, but rather with an act of recollection: Ἀμφὶ Διώνυσον... | μνήσομαι ὥς ἐφάνη (*Hh.*7.1-2). The poet begins by ‘remembering’ how Dionysus appeared by the shore in the guise of a young man. Scholars frequently note how this appears to be a simple variant for the imperatival ἔννεπε/ἔσπετε found in other hymnic introductions,<sup>96</sup> but the foregrounding of memory is noteworthy and may suggest that the subsequent story of Dionysus’ capture and revenge was a pre-existing and familiar story. After all, as scholars have suggested, the delocalised and distilled nature of the hymn’s narrative seems to presuppose a fuller pre-existing tradition of Dionysian epiphany and retribution.<sup>97</sup>

These various examples, however, are slim pickings, and indicate how indexical memory is an almost exclusively Homeric phenomenon in our extant remains of early Greek epic, far more so than in the case of indexical hearsay. This is a significant finding, and one that could lend support to those scholars who picture Homeric epic as ‘meta-Cyclic’ or ‘meta-epic’, uniquely positioning itself against larger traditions in an extremely self-conscious manner.<sup>98</sup> However, it is likely that this apparent Homeric monopoly on indexical memory is largely a result of the narrative form of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, rather than any unique self-reflexivity. This allusive mode relies especially on the presence of character speech in extended mythical narratives, precisely what we find repeatedly in Homer, but very rarely in the rest of extant archaic Greek epic. If other early Greek epics survived in their entirety, our picture would likely be very different. It is well known that Proclus’ summaries of the Epic Cycle downplay

<sup>96</sup> Cf. *Hh.*19.1, 33.1; Allen et al. (1936) 380; Jaillard (2011) 140n.19. For a full list of hymnic introductory phrases: Pavese (1991) 160-62

<sup>97</sup> Jaillard (2011) 144; Jáuregi (2013) 242. The next extant appearances of the myth are in Pindar (*fr.*236; cf. Philodemus, *De pietate*, *P.Herc.*1088.fr.6; Obbink (1995) 203-4) and Euripides (*Cycl.*11-12). For fuller accounts: *Ov.Met.*3.582-691; *Nonn.Dion.*45.105-68. On the myth: Crusius (1889); James (1975); Herter (1980).

<sup>98</sup> Finkelberg (1998) 154-55, (2011), (2015). Cf. Burgess (2006) 149.

the significance of character speech, making it very difficult to see what role it played there.<sup>99</sup> Rather than claiming 'poetic memory' as something originally or distinctively 'Homeric', then, it is better to see it as particularly tied to Homer's blend of the mimetic and diegetic modes.

As we turn now to the limited use of the index in lyric poetry, we shall find further evidence to support this conclusion.

---

<sup>99</sup> Sammons (2017) 230-31.



### III.3 Lyric Recall

Archaic lyricists were no less concerned with memory and the immortalising aspect of poetry than their epic counterparts. They too fostered a close relationship with the Muses: they boast of being the Muses' attendants, messengers, spokesmen, helpers and even sons,<sup>100</sup> and they often talk of their poetry or their own poetic ability as a 'gift of the Muses'.<sup>101</sup> Like epic poets, too, they invoke the Muses as a source of inspiration, to grace them with their presence,<sup>102</sup> to begin a new song,<sup>103</sup> to give lovely charm to their poetry,<sup>104</sup> and – in epic style – to sing on a certain subject or answer a specific question.<sup>105</sup> But it is above all because of the Muses' ability to know everything (ἴσθ'...πάντα, Pind.*Pae*.fr.52f.54-6) and to bestow metaphorical immortality in song that they are often summoned, thanks to their close association with memory.<sup>106</sup> More generally, lyric poets are also deeply invested in preserving the memory of whatever they narrate, including places (*Ol*.6.92, *Pyth*.9.88), gods (*Nem*.7.80), *laudandi* (*Isth*.8.62, *Nem*.7.15; Simon.fr.*eleg*.24-25) and themselves (Thgn.100 = 1164d). Just like epic poets, they are embedded in an elaborate system of literary commemoration and preservation.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> Attendant: Sapph.fr.150; Thgn.769; Bacchyl.5.192-93. Messenger: Pind.*Ol*.6.90-91. Spokesman: Pind.*Pae*.6.6; Bacchyl.9.3; cf. Pind.fr.150. Helper: Pind.*Ol*.13.96-97. Son: Pind.*Nem*.3.1.

<sup>101</sup> Archil.fr.1.2; Sapph.fr.32; Solon fr.13.51; Thgn.250; Bacchyl.5.4; Pind.*Ol*.7.7.

<sup>102</sup> Sapph.fr.127-28; Stesichorus fr.90.8-9.

<sup>103</sup> Alcm.frr.14a, 27.

<sup>104</sup> Alcm.fr.27.2-3, Pind.fr.75.2; cf. Hes.*Theog*.104. In this respect, they are closely associated with the Χάριτες, who also grant poetic charm: Hes.*Theog*.64-65; Sapph.fr.103.5, fr.128; Pind.*Pyth*.9.1-4, *Nem*.9.53-5.

<sup>105</sup> Subject: Simon.fr.*eleg*.11.20-28; Hipponax fr.128; cf. Hom.*Il*.1.1, *Od*.1.1. Question: Bacchyl.15.47; Pind.*Pyth*.4.70-2; cf. *Il*.1.8.

<sup>106</sup> Sapph.fr.55; Bacchyl.3.90-98, 9.81-87; Pind.*Ol*.10.91-96, *Pyth*.1.93-100, *Pyth*.3.112-15, *Nem*.6.26-35; *Nem*.7.11-16, *Isthm*.7.16-26, *Isthm*.8.56a-63, fr.121; Arist., *Hymn to Virtue*, 842.17-19 PMG. On occasion, lyricists pointedly play on the Muses' etymological association with memory: Μουσῶν μνησόμεθ', Thgn.1056; μνα<μο>νόοι, Pind.fr.431, Μοῖσα μεμνᾶσθαι φιλεῖ, *Nem*.1.11-12.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Spelman (2018a) esp. 63-78. For similar concerns in Attic tragedy: Wright (2010) 169-71.

The anxiety of forgetfulness also underlies much lyric poetry, where song again proves the antidote to eternal oblivion.<sup>108</sup> In Pindar's epinicia, oblivion is aligned with silence, darkness and obscurity as a foil to the commemorative 'light' of song: in *Nemean* 7, the poet acknowledges that 'great deeds of valour remain in deep darkness when they lack hymns' (ταῖ μεγάλοι γὰρ ἀλκαί | σκότον πολὺν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι, *Nem.*7.12-13) and they are only preserved 'if, by the grace of Mnemosyne with the shining crown, one finds a recompense for one's labours in poetry's famous songs' (εἰ Μναμοσύνας ἑκατι λιπαράμπυκος | εὖρηται ἄποινα μόχθων κλυταῖς ἐπέων ἀοιδαῖς, *Nem.*7.15-16): it is the shining light of poetic Memory that ensures one's legacy in the face of gloomy forgetfulness.<sup>109</sup> Similarly, Sappho remarks that an unknown addressee will lack any remembrance (μναμοσύνα) after dying and will wander 'unseen' (ἀφανής) in the house of Hades because she has 'no share in the roses of Pieria', the birthplace of the Muses (οὐ γὰρ πεδέχης βροδῶν | τῶν ἐκ Πιερίας, fr.55); by apparently failing to mention the addressee's name, Sappho ensures her Muse-less and forgotten fate.<sup>110</sup> By contrast, the poetess is confident that she and another addressee will be remembered 'in the future' (μνάσασθαί τινά φαιμι † καὶ ἔτερον † ἀμμέων, fr.147: καὶ ἄψερον Lobel, cf. fr.17.6 with Burris et al. (2014)) and that she will not be forgotten even after death (οὐδ' ἀποθανούσης ἔσται λήθη, *Ael.Aristid.Or.*28.51 = fr.193).<sup>111</sup> Lyricists were thus concerned to preserve both their subject matter and their own name from the threat of eternal oblivion.

In the following sections, we shall consider the limited evidence for indexical memory in lyric, beginning with lyricists' recollections of their contemporary present (§III.3.1), before focusing on examples where mythical material is indexed through the language of

<sup>108</sup> Segal (1986) 70-73; Montiglio (2000) 82-115.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. *Isth.*7.17-19 with Agócs (2009). Athletic victories can also put an end to the oblivion of a household (ἐπαυσε λάθαν, *Nem.*6.20-21), another parallel between song and deed: Segal (1986) 72.

<sup>110</sup> Those who quote the passage only identify the addressee as an 'uneducated' (ἀπαίδευτον, *Stob.*3.4.12), 'wealthy' (πλουσίαν, *Plut.Coniug.Praec.*145f-146a) or 'uncultured and ignorant' woman (τινα τῶν ἀμούσων καὶ ἀμαθῶν, *Plut.Quaest.Conv.*646e-f). The absence of her name 'suggests that Sappho omitted it' (Hardie (2005) 18). The anonymity is reinforced by etymological play between ἀφανής and Αἶδα (cf. *Il.*5.844-45; *Soph.Aj.*606-7; *Pl.Cra.*403a, *Grg.*493b, *Phd.*80d-81a).

<sup>111</sup> On Sappho's poetic immortality: Hardie (2005); Lardinois (2008); Spelman (2018a) 155-161.

recall (§IV.3.2). We shall close by exploring how lyricists transformed the functioning of indexical knowledge by directly appealing to their audiences' familiarity with the literary past (§IV.3.3).

### III.3.1 Meagre Memories

When we turn to extant lyric poetry, there is little direct parallel for the cases of indexical memory that we have identified in Homer – an absence that is all the more striking given lyric poetry's considerable use of indexical hearsay. As in the larger corpus of archaic Greek epic beyond Homer, we can identify very few cases in which a character's reminiscences overlap with the audience's recall of the literary and mythical past. We shall consider the possible reasons for this in further detail below, but at the outset we can acknowledge that we are hindered by the fragmentary state of our evidence and the general dearth of extended character speech in extant archaic lyric.

Another major distinction between lyric and epic poetry, however, is the concern that lyricists display with their immediate present. Lyricists frequently picture themselves and their audiences in their own contemporary world and focus more on personalised reminiscences from the recent, rather than mythical, past. The Lesbian poetess Sappho, in particular, shows an emphatic concern with the memories of (what she depicts as) her personal, lived experience.<sup>112</sup> In one fragment, the narrator addresses a departing woman and bids her '**remember** me for **you know** how we followed you' (μέμναισ', οἶσθα γὰρ ὥς σε πεδῆπομεν', fr.94.8) and goes on to '**remind**' her of all that they experienced with a catalogue

---

<sup>112</sup> On the Sapphic theme of memory: Maehler (1963) 59-63; Burnett (1983) 277-313; Raynor (2005); Lardinois (2008); Calame (2012). Lardinois' theory that Sappho was concerned primarily with memory of her performances, rather than of her songs, is rightly criticised by Spelman (2018a) 158n.81.

of past loves and festivities (ὄμναισαι, fr.94.10-29).<sup>113</sup> In another fragment, a woman who has departed to Lydia ‘**remembers** gentle Atthis with longing’ (ἀγάνας ἐπιμνάσθεις Ἀτθίδος ἰμέρω, fr.96.15-16), while in the famous priamel on τὸ κάλλιστον, the speaker’s description of Helen ‘**reminds**’ her of another absent female friend, Anactoria (Ἰμε νῦν Ἀνακτορίδας ὀνέμναισ’ | [οὐ] παρθεοίσας, fr.16.15-16). These and other fragments evoke a network of fond female farewells, in which memory played a key role in preserving social bonds, apparently a far cry from the functioning of poetic memory in the heroic world of archaic epic.<sup>114</sup>

The same social and contextual aspect of memory can also be found in the work of many other lyric poets. In a ‘ship-of-state’ poem by Sappho’s Lesbian contemporary Alcaeus, the poet encourages his addressees to ‘**remember** the **previous** (hardships?)’ that they had endured as inspiration to stand steadfast in the present (μνάσθητε τῶν πάροιθε μύχθων, fr.6.11, suppl. Hunt), evoking the turbulent and stasiotic life of his *hetaireia* on Lesbos.<sup>115</sup> Archilochus bids his friend Glaucus to ‘**remember**’ the land (ἐπιμνήσαιο, fr.96.3). Alcman hopes to preserve the ‘**memory** of those present’ (ἔστι παρόντων μνάσιν † ἐπιθέσθαι †, fr.118). And Pindar claims that Hieron will be ‘**reminded**’ of the battles in which he previously stood steadfast (ἀμνάσειεν, *Pyth.*1.47). Lyric poets’ frequent focus on the present and recent past thus differs strikingly from epicists’ immersion in the distant world of myth.

Even here, however, it is possible that these emphatic appeals to recall may have served an indexical role, recalling recent poetry and songs on recent events. Sappho, in particular, is a likely candidate for such poetic self-reference. As we have already seen, she is insistent elsewhere that she and her group will be remembered in the future, unlike the anonymous addressee of fr.55 (§III.3: 162). Following Sappho’s own rhetoric of commemoration, we could say that the episodes and people recalled in her fragments are familiar precisely because of their mentions in her larger poetic corpus. Indeed, Atthis appears repeatedly elsewhere (fr.49,

<sup>113</sup> Burnett (1979). Cf. fr.24a: Sappho refers to her addressee’s memory of what she and they used to do in their youth (Ἰεμνάσεσθ’); fr.88(a).10-11: references to knowledge ([ο]ἶσθα καὶ τα) and forgetting ([λέ]λαθ’).

<sup>114</sup> On Sappho’s *hetairai*: Schlesier (2013).

<sup>115</sup> For discomfort with the ‘ship-of-state’ tag: Uhlig (2018). Memory also features prominently in Alcaeus’ more exiguous fragments, e.g. fr.75.7 ([μέ]μναιμι); fr.206.4 (ἐπιμνα. ἰ); fr.169a.6 (μναμι).

90fr.10a.15, 131), as does Anactoria (fr.219, 253). As Sappho recalls these absent women and her former experiences with them, we are simultaneously invited to recall their presence in her other poems.

The same may also be true of Alcaeus. His extant poems foreground their future reception less insistently than Sappho's,<sup>116</sup> but at various points he acknowledges their enduring appeal, as when he claims that the weapons which he has just described 'cannot be **forgotten**' (τῶν οὐκ ἔστι **λάθεσθ'**, fr.140.15) – a remark that 'figures the poetic memorability of his own description.'<sup>117</sup> The poet's recall of previous hardships in fr.6, then, may similarly look back to other poems of the Alcaean corpus, perhaps evoking a larger cycle of ship-of-state songs. After all, the poet's opening remark that a wave comes upon the ship '**again**' in the manner of a '**previous** one' certainly encourages recollection of the recent past (τόδ' αὖτε κύμα τὸ **προτέρω** τνέμω † | στείχει, fr.6.1-2). Similar arguments could be advanced for the other examples above, including Pindar's praise of Hieron's martial achievements, which could have been celebrated elsewhere in song, and Archilochus' appeal to Glaucus, a figure who reappears elsewhere in his poetry (fr.15, 105, 117, 131). Ultimately, such suggestions can be no more than tempting conjectures on current evidence, but it is worth acknowledging that indexical memory may not have been restricted to the realm of myth in lyric. It may have also been adapted to lyricists' intense engagement with their contemporary present.

### III.3.2 Mythical Recall

We are on slightly firmer ground, however, in the few identifiable lyric cases in which the mythical past itself appears to have been allusively recalled through the language of memory, in both the narrator's and the character's voice. As in epic, such reminiscences are a way of

---

<sup>116</sup> Spelman (2018a) 155, 161-62.

<sup>117</sup> Fearn (2018) 104, noting (p.105n.39) further cases where forgetfulness thematises literary permanence: Alc.fr.70.9, fr.73.8.

gesturing to other traditions or mythical episodes. Most lyric instances of this phenomenon appear to exhibit a markedly epic resonance, as if lyricists were specifically acknowledging the epic heritage of the indexical device. In this section, we shall first explore the meagre traces of the phenomenon in embedded character speech, before turning to lyric narrator's own reminiscences of the epic past.

When we turn to extant lyric's treatment of myth, we can find nothing precisely comparable to the Homeric cases of indexical recollection that we have explored above. There is no clear case of a character recalling an event from the mythical or poetic past. However, we might be able to detect potential traces of something similar in several fragments and testimonia. The participle *μεμνημένος* in an extremely scrappy fragment of Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* may point to an intratextual recollection of a promise made by Poseidon earlier in the narrative, akin to the intratextual recall of the Iliadic theomachy (fr.18.6-8).<sup>118</sup> But it is difficult to put too much weight on this: not only are the supplements surrounding the verb extremely uncertain,<sup>119</sup> but in earlier and later literature, other similar 'reminiscences' often invoke a promise or oath that has not in fact been mentioned previously.<sup>120</sup> Setting aside this example, then, our only other potential case of indexical recall in a mythical narrative is Archilochus' treatment of Deianeira's rape by Nessus and the centaur's subsequent death at Heracles' hands. For this poem, we have no direct text at all, but only a number of indirect references (frr.286-89). Among these is the critique of Dio Chrysostom, who claims that some objected to the manner in which Archilochus portrayed this episode (Archilochus fr.286 = Dio Chrys.60.1):

ἔχεις μοι λῦσαι ταύτην τὴν ἀπορίαν, πότερον δικαίως ἐγκαλοῦσιν οἱ μὲν τῷ  
 Ἀρχιλόχῳ, οἱ δὲ τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ, περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Νέσσον καὶ τὴν Δηιάνειραν, ἢ οὐ;

<sup>118</sup> Barrett (2007a) 17; Davies – Finglass (2014) 282.

<sup>119</sup> Curtis (2011) 133-34 challenges the popular supplements of Lobel, Page and Barrett, but his alternative proposals are equally problematic: Finglass (2012) 356; Coward (2013) 164.

<sup>120</sup> E.g. *Od.*10.483-6 (Heubeck (1989) 68); *Soph.Trach.*1222-4 (*μεμνημένος*, though perhaps a partial reference to *Trach.*1181-90); *Ar.Ran.*1469-70 (*μεμνημένος*: Dover (1993) 378, comparing *Soph.Phil.*941).

φασὶ γὰρ οἱ μὲν τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον ληρεῖν ποιοῦντα τὴν Δηϊάνειραν ἐν τῷ βιάζεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κενταύρου πρὸς τὸν Ἡρακλέα ῥαψωδοῦσαν, ἀναμνησκουσάν τῃς τοῦ Ἀχελώου μνηστείας καὶ τῶν τότε γενομένων, ὥστε πολλὴν σχολὴν εἶναι τῷ Νέσσω ὅτι ἐβούλετο προᾶξει· οἱ δὲ τὸν Σοφοκλέα πρὸ τοῦ καιροῦ πεποιηκέναι τὴν τοξείαν, διαβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἔτι τὸν ποταμόν.

Dio's anonymous critics considered the length of Deianeira's appeal to Heracles inappropriate in context, giving her assailant all too much time to have his wicked way with her.<sup>121</sup> To prompt such critical censure, Deianeira's speech must have been an account of some length. The participle ῥαψωδοῦσαν certainly suggests as much, figuring Deianeira as an epic rhapsode, stringing out an extensive recitation.<sup>122</sup>

Most significant for us here, however, is the content of her speech: according to Dio, she '**reminded**' Heracles of her earlier wooing by Achelous and the events that took place at that time (ἀναμνησκουσάν), recalling a previous occasion on which Heracles had faced another bestial foe to secure Deianeira's hand in marriage.<sup>123</sup> We know little more about the speech than what Dio gives us, but a Homeric scholion provides the further detail that Archilochus depicted Achelous in a taurine form, in comparison to the resiliently fluvial Scamander of *Iliad* 22 (Archil.fr.287). In that case, we might suspect that Deianeira's report included a key detail known from many later accounts, a detail which is first explicitly attested in Pindar: that Heracles tore off one of Achelous' horns in the skirmish.<sup>124</sup>

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Diod.Sic.4.36.3, where Heracles' arrow strikes Nessus while he is mid-intercourse.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Swift (forthcoming) ad loc.: 'ῥαψωδοῦσαν and ἀναμνησκουσάν imply a reasonable amount of narrative'. Originally, ῥαψωδία appears to have been used for any spoken or recitative metre, but over time it 'became more and more associated with epic and with Homer': Ford (1988) 306.

<sup>123</sup> On the myth and the river: Isler (1970) 123-91; Brewster (1997) 9-14. The river is mentioned elsewhere in early Greek poetry: *Il.*21.194, *Hes.Theog.*340, *fr.*10a.35, *Pind.Pae.*21.fr.52v.9, *fr.*70. Its earliest appearances in iconography date to the seventh and sixth centuries BCE: Ostrowski (1991) 16-17.

<sup>124</sup> *Pind.fr.*249a; *Ov.Am.*3.6.35-36, *Met.*8.882-84, 9.85-88, *Her.*9.139-40, 16.267-68; *Nonn.Dion.*17.238-39; *Apollod.Bibl.* 2.7.5; *Philostr.Imag.*4.3; *Hyg.Fab.*31.7. Rationalised by Diod.Sic.4.35.3; Strabo 10.2.19. Sophocles may allude to this detail in his account's emphasis on Achelous' horns (*Trach.*507-8, 519, 520-22).

We do not have any original verses from this poem, and we do not even have direct evidence of its genre or metre. But Bowie has plausibly argued that Archilochus' poem was a narrative elegy,<sup>125</sup> and it is tempting to suppose that Dio's summary reflects, at least in part, the basic language and structure of Archilochus' original. In that case, given Dio's emphasis on Deianeira 'reminding' Heracles, the captured maiden could have explicitly prompted Heracles to recall the former occasion of the conflict with Achelous, perhaps even introducing it with the formula ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε, a phrase that we have seen repeatedly in Homer. The Achelous episode would have provided a natural model for Heracles' current situation, marking Nessus as a doublet of the river, another rival for Deianeira's affections.<sup>126</sup> In addition, it would presage his coming defeat: like Achelous, Nessus is no match for Heracles. Just as the Iliadic Achilles recalled his former encounter with Aeneas, so too here would Deianeira recall a former tussle for her love as a paradigm for the present.

Admittedly, this is a speculative case, dependent on the language of Dio's summary, but it is the closest we come to the Homeric usage of this device in lyric. It may thus be significant that this potential instance occurs in a strongly epicising context. As Bowie notes, '[o]n the scant evidence we have, this is a poem in which elegy handled material usually treated in hexameter epic, and did so in the same way as hexameter epic.'<sup>127</sup> Indexical memory may have thus carried a distinctively epic resonance, a resonance which would have been all the stronger if Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* did indeed contain a comparable example. Scholars have

---

<sup>125</sup> Bowie (2001) 51-52, noting that Longinus pairs Archilochus and Eratosthenes as elegiac poets (*de subl.*33.5), and that Archilochus' uncontrolled, abundant flood of verses there (Ἀρχιλόχου πολλὰ καὶ ἀνοικονόμητα παρὰσύνοντος) matches Deianeira's uncontrolled outburst here. He further notes that an embedded exemplum is unlikely, given that other Archilochean exempla seem to be animal fables (fr.172-181, 184-87, 192; though now see the Telephus elegy, fr.17a: §II.3.1: 90n.81), while the unsuitable length of Deianeira's speech suggests a self-standing narrative.

<sup>126</sup> In later art and literature, these two river-based incidents were presented as doublets: e.g. *Ov.Her.*9.138-42, *Met.*9.96-102. The throne of Apollo at Amyclae featured both episodes (Paus.3.18.12, 16) and Sophocles' *Trachiniae* narrated both in quick succession (*Trach.*507-30, 555-81).

<sup>127</sup> Bowie (2010b) 150. Notopoulos (1966) even used this poem as evidence for his argument that Archilochus composed hexameters, but note the scepticism of Aloni (1984); Bowie (1986) 34.



long remarked on the epicising nature of Stesichorean lyric,<sup>128</sup> and an epicising narrative is more likely to exhibit extended character speech, the prime host for indexical recall. Indeed, if we had a complete text of other Stesichorean poems, such as the *Oresteia*, *Nostoi* or *Games for Pelias*, we may well expect to find further cases there.

As things stand, however, we have to turn to the narrator's own voice to explore other potential cases of indexical memory. At times, the lyric narrator notes that characters did or did not remember an aspect of the mythical past, a comment that invites an audience to recall their own knowledge of the myth in question. In *Isthmian* 8, for example, Pindar claims that the gods '**remembered**' the pre-eminence of the Aeacids (ἐμμέναντ') at the time when (ὅτ') Zeus and Poseidon quarrelled over marrying Thetis (*Isth.*8.24-31). This opening emphasis on memory not only acknowledges the traditional excellence of the Aeacid line (including Achilles, Ajax and Peleus),<sup>129</sup> but also serves as a springboard into the narrator's own recollection of the marriage of Thetis and Peleus. The combination of a verb of memory with the temporal conjunction ὅτε is almost a Pindaric rebranding of the common epic formula ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε; the phrase has been redistributed but retains its allusive function.

Scholars have long debated whether Pindar is here following a familiar tradition or innovating, especially on the points of Zeus and Poseidon's quarrel for Thetis, as well as Themis' subsequent intrusion and prophecy revealing the danger of Thetis' offspring for its father.<sup>130</sup> If these were Pindaric inventions, the poet's appeal to divine 'memory' may partly authorise this departure (especially when compounded by the concluding φαντί, *Pyth.*8.46a). There is some evidence, however, that these elements are not complete fabrications: as Burnett notes, Themis' role might already be suggested by an early sixth century dinos of Sophilos (*LIMC* s.v. 'Peleus' 211), on which Themis follows immediately after Cheiron in the wedding

---

<sup>128</sup> West (2015).

<sup>129</sup> Cf. *Isth.*8.40, where their piety is indexically marked (φάτις).

<sup>130</sup> Inventions: Σ *Isth.*8.57b, Σ *Isth.*8.67; Köhnken (1975) 34n.19; Hubbard (1987) 5-16; Rutherford (2015) 456; Spelman (2018b) §3. Tradition: Solmsen (1949) 128n.19; Stoneman (1981) 58-62.

procession.<sup>131</sup> Regardless of the degree of Pindaric innovation, however, it is significant that this myth is introduced as an act of character memory, precipitating the audience's own similar recall of the mythic past.<sup>132</sup>

Besides these cases of internal characters' memories within poems, however, we can also identify instances where a lyric narrator foregrounds his or her own memory at a moment of allusion to mythical precedents and prototypes. Here too, the myths recalled have a distinctively epic tinge. In *Nemean* 9, Pindar uses an act of recall as a springboard into his lengthy account of Adrastus, Amphiaraus and the expedition against Thebes, evoking Theban myth (μνάσθεις, *Nem.*9.10-27). In another unplaced fragment, he bids Apollo 'remember' that Heracles set up an altar to him and Zeus on Paros (μνάσθηθ' ὅτι, fr.140a.62-69), recalling the hero's sojourn on the island during his quest for Hippolyte's belt before his initial expedition to Troy, a tale that likely dates at least to the time of Archilochus.<sup>133</sup> In a poem of the *Theognidea*, meanwhile, the speaker's personal memory precipitates a summary account of archetypally epic adventures (Thgn.1123-28):

μή με κακῶν μίμνησκε· πέπονθά τοι οἶά τ' Ὀδυσσεύς,  
 ὅς τ' Αἰδεω μέγα δῶμ' ἤλυθεν ἐξαναδύς.  
 ὃς δὴ καὶ μνηστῆρας ἀνείλετο νηλεί θυμῷ  
 Πηνελόπης εὖφρων κουριδῆς ἀλόχου,  
 ἧ μιν δῆθ' ὑπέμεινε φίλῳ παρὰ παιδὶ μένουσα,

<sup>131</sup> Burnett (2005) 115n.28. She further notes that some sort of mediator is 'implicit in the abandoned rivalry of Zeus and Poseidon, as seen at *N.5.37*'. In the versions of the *Cypria* (fr.2) and Hesiodic *Catalogue* (fr.210), Thetis honours Hera by refusing Zeus, who then gives her to Peleus, so there is no need for Themis' intervention.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. Sapph.fr.16.10-11, where the Helen who fails to remember her family when she goes to Troy (κωὺδ[ἐ]... ἐμνάσθη) is a tangential 'recollection' of the epic heroine, who was all too mindful of what she had abandoned (*Il.*3.139-40, 3.174-75): Rissman (1983) 41; Segal (1998a) 66-67. Helen's forgetfulness may model the narrator's own skewed memory of the epic tradition.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. I.C. Rutherford (2001) 377-82; Apollod.*Bibl.*2.5.9. Pre-Archilochian origin: Swift (2014b) 441. Heracles' settlement of the Parian sons of Minos on Thasos offers a mythical prototype for the Parian colonisation of Thasos by Archilochus and/or his father Telesicles (cf. Marcaccini (2001); Kivilo (2010) 92, 94, 98-99) and their conflicts with Thracian locals (fr.5, fr.93a; Tsantsanoglou (2008)).

ὄφρα τε γῆς ἐπέβη †δειμαλέους γε μυχούστ†.

The speaker's wish not to be '**reminded**' of his ills segues into the recall of a mythical figure who has endured such suffering: the epic Odysseus, an archetypal endurer (πέπονθα ~ πάθεν, *Od.*1.1). After launching into the exemplum with an act of recall, Theognis focuses on two major episodes of the hero's *fabula*: the descent to the Underworld and his slaughter of the suitors. Such an Odyssean analogy fits into the larger narratorial posturing of the *Theognidea*,<sup>134</sup> or – if Bowie is right to ascribe the poem to Archilochus – the iambicist's similar Odyssean persona.<sup>135</sup> Most crucial for my current purpose, however, is how this mythical exemplum is once again introduced with the language of memory: the speaker's recall of his own ills prompts the recollection of an epic exemplar of such suffering. Personal memory transitions to mythical memory.

A similar blurring of personal and mythical recall occurs in Tyrtaeus' elegy on ἀρετή, in which the poet begins with a catalogue of mythological exempla introduced by another verb of memory (Tyrtaeus fr.12.1-9):<sup>136</sup>

οὐτ' ἂν μνησαίμην οὐτ' ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθείην  
οὐτε ποδῶν ἀρετῆς οὐτε παλαιμοσύνης,  
οὐδ' εἰ Κυκλώπων μὲν ἔχοι μέγεθος τε βίην τε,  
νικῶν δὲ θεῶν Θρηϊκίον Βορέην,  
οὐδ' εἰ Τιθωνοῖο φυὴν χαριέστερος εἴη,  
πλουτοίη δὲ Μίδεω καὶ Κινύρεω μάλιον,  
οὐδ' εἰ Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἴη,  
γλῶσσαν δ' Ἀδρήστου μελιχόγηρυν ἔχοι,  
οὐδ' εἰ πᾶσαν ἔχοι δόξαν πλὴν θούριδος ἀλκῆς·

In this opening priamel, the poet exalts θούρις ἀλκή as the pinnacle of ἀρετή, dismissing other candidates for the title (extraordinary strength, speed, beauty, wealth, royalty and eloquence), which are each represented by a famous mythical hero. Tyrtaeus insists that he would 'not

<sup>134</sup> Nagy (1985) 74-76, noting the themes of νόος, poverty and versatility.

<sup>135</sup> Bowie (2008) 140-41. Odyssean Archilochus: Seidensticker (1978).

<sup>136</sup> Luginbill (2002) convincingly defends this poem's authenticity.

**recall** nor tell **in story** a man who even outstripped these mythical forebears, preferring instead the man who is good in battle, an opposition reinforced by verbal repetition: ἄνδρα, fr.12.1 ~ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς...ἐν πολέμῳ, fr.12.10 = fr.12.20, ἀνὴρ...πολέμου, fr.12.43-44).<sup>137</sup> As Shey has highlighted, however, these exempla are carefully selected to emphasise the dangers of these other traits: 'In every instance, the mythological characters of the priamel possess *aretaí* which cause harm to themselves or others, or which are unable to save them from harm, unhappiness, or bad reputation': Polyphemus's brawn was outwitted by Odysseus's brains, Tithonus' beauty eventually withered into an extreme old age, and so on.<sup>138</sup> The larger tradition lying behind each name implicitly indicates why Tyrtaeus most highly values θοῦρις ἀλκή.

To build on Shey's point, we could note how the opening emphasis on memory and λόγος encourages an audience to recall these wider traditions and to fill in the rest of each story which implicitly proves Tyrtaeus' point. As a common tactic of *praeteritio*, the speaker invites his audience to recall what he claims he will leave unspoken. Of course, if we wanted to, we could easily find a mythical candidate who equally exemplifies the dangers of θοῦρις ἀλκή: Telamonian Ajax exhibits this very trait in Homer (e.g. *Il.*11.566), but as we have already seen, he too comes to an ignominious end. Tyrtaeus, however, avoids pointing us in that direction, and rather encourages us to recall the *fabulae* surrounding the characters he does name. In this poem, memory has shifted from a character's embedded speech to the narrator's own voice. His power of memory controls which myths are recalled or not.

As Schwinge has emphasised, however, this priamel is not purely ethical, for it also has a larger poetic and generic significance. Tyrtaeus is not just dismissing specific myths associated with other potential ἀρεταί, but also a collection of myths with a distinctively epic timbre.<sup>139</sup> Most of the heroes he cites are familiar from the epic tradition; the values they

<sup>137</sup> For this rendering of ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθείην and the associations of λόγος: Gerber (1970) 75; Schwinge (1997) 388; Année (2010).

<sup>138</sup> Shey (1976) 7-13 (quotation p.9).

<sup>139</sup> Schwinge (1997) esp. 390-91. On Tyrtaeus and epic generally: Romney (2011).

represent are valorised in epic;<sup>140</sup> and the very language in which they are here expressed also draws heavily on the epic tradition: verse-ends, in particular, exhibit a whole host of familiar epic idioms,<sup>141</sup> while the phrase Ἀδρήστου μειλιχόγηρυν (v.8) may also draw on an epic formula associated with lost Theban epic.<sup>142</sup> The poet's opening appeal to his own memory thus triggers the recall of a host of epic traditions as a foil for his own elegiac poem, with its new attitude towards ἀρετή. In what follows, he articulates an alternative poetics distanced from epic. By beginning with his own act of memory (μνησαίμην), he even usurps the traditional role of the epic Muses (μνησαίαθ', *Il.*2.492). The poet's memory thus evokes and appropriates the epic tradition – in many ways, a foreshadowing of the Roman *recusatio*.

Indexical memory in lyric, therefore, was not restricted to internal characters' recollections of their own fictional autobiographies, but also extended to the memory of poetic narrators, especially in elegy. In both cases, however, it is worth emphasising again that the myths recalled have a distinctively epic resonance: Archilochus' Heracles, Pindar's Peleus, Theognis' Odysseus and Tyrtaeus' catalogue of epic figures. Indexical memory seems particularly associated with the epic past, implicitly acknowledging the precedent of Homer.

Nevertheless, we must admit that archaic lyric offers us relatively slim pickings, especially when we compare its examples to Homeric instances of indexical memory. As with the larger corpus of archaic Greek epic, I suspect the major reason for this is our general dearth of extended mythical narrative in lyric. Greek lyricists frequently introduce myths in passing and in summary form, as paradigms for their present. And in so doing, they rarely give direct voice to the characters of the mythical past. With this dominant approach to myth, it is unsurprising to find fewer cases of indexical memory in extant lyric.

<sup>140</sup> Cf. Tarkow (1983) 51, who highlights Tyrtaeus' 'implicit rejection of a characteristically Homeric manner of describing activities', e.g. βοὴν ἀγαθός (*Il.*2.408); πῦξ ἀγαθός (*Il.*3.237). Note the inversion of epic values in v.16 (ξυνὸν δ' ἐσθλὸν ~ *Il.*16.262, ξυνὸν δὲ κακόν: Fuqua (1981) 218n.11).

<sup>141</sup> v.3 (μέγεθος τε βίην τε) = *Il.*7.288; v.4 (Θρηϊκίον βορέην) ~ Hes.*Op.*553 (Θρηϊκίου Βορέω); v.7 (βασιλεύτερος εἶη) ~ *Il.*9.160, 9.392, 10.239 (βασιλεύτερος ἐστίν/εἶμι).

<sup>142</sup> Campbell (1982) 180, comparing μελίγηρυν Ἀδραστον (Pl.*Phaedr.*269a) and suggesting the *Thebais* as a possible common source.

### III.3.3 Audience Knowledge

As we have seen, lyricists rarely invoke audience's memories of events. When they do, it is more often through the narrator's own recollection, rather than those of its internal characters. When we turn to cases of indexical knowledge, however, it appears that lyric's capacity for more direct engagement between narrator and audience revitalised this allusive mode. Lyricists occasionally assert their own knowledge of the poetic past, as when Alcaeus claims that he **'knows for certain'** that one should not move gravel (οἶδ' ἦ μάν, fr.344.1), advice that he may have drawn directly from a poem by his Lesbian contemporary Sappho (μὴ κίνη χέραδος, fr.145 ~ χέραδος μὴ ... | κίνεις, Alc.fr.344.1-2).<sup>143</sup> More frequently, however, lyricists appeal directly to their audience's own knowledge of the literary and mythical past. In these cases, we can trace the significance of these allusions more clearly than with lyricists' indexical memory. Poets appeal to their audience's familiarity with tradition, explicitly evoking what 'you all know'. In so doing, they again validate their own work and situate it within a larger tradition.

One such appeal to audience knowledge is Pindar's evocation of Ajax's suicide in *Isthmian* 4 (*Isth*.4.35a-36b):

ἴστε μάν

Αἴαντος ἀλκὰν φοίνιον, τὰν ὀψία (35b)

ἐν νυκτὶ ταμῶν περὶ ᾧ φασγάνῳ μομφὰν ἔχει  
παίδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ' ἔβαν. (36b)

Pindar directly invokes his audience's acquaintance with Ajax's ἀλκή, another element familiar from the epic tradition (cf. above on Tyrtaeus' θοῦρις ἀλκή). Here, however, the poet does not just evoke Ajax's character in general, but rather a specific episode of his *fabula*: his

<sup>143</sup> The expression may be proverbial, but for Alcaeus' direct reception of Sappho elsewhere, see §I.2.3: 44 (Alc.fr.384); Whitmarsh (2018) 146-48 (Sapph.fr.16 ~ Alc.fr.283). Alcaeus' use of the emphatic particle μάν reappears in Pindaric appeals to knowledge (below): cf. Spelman (2018a) 52n.27.

ignominious suicide after losing to Odysseus in the contest for Achilles' arms, familiar from Cyclic epic and archaic art onwards.<sup>144</sup>

It is unclear, however, how stable the details of Ajax's death were in the early tradition. As Spelman has highlighted, at least in later tradition, the timing of his suicide differs from that in Pindar's account.<sup>145</sup> In Sophocles' *Ajax*, the eponymous hero kills himself during the daytime, a version of events that seems to be found in other later treatments of the myth.<sup>146</sup> It is possible, therefore, that this appeal to the audience's knowledge looks to more precise precedent than the epic tradition in general: a specific version in which Ajax killed himself at night. In that case, the scholium to this passage would offer a plausible candidate: in discussing the polyvalence of the phrase ὀψία ἐν νυκτί ('late in the night', 35b-36), it notes that 'the details of the story agree with those who take the expression as denoting the morning; for the author of the *Aethiopis* says that Ajax killed himself towards dawn' (τοῖς δὲ τὸν ὄρθρον ἀκούουσι καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἱστορίας συνάδει· ὁ γὰρ τὴν Αἰθιοπίδα γράφων περὶ τὸν ὄρθρον φησὶ τὸν Αἴαντα ἑαυτὸν ἀνελεῖν, Σ *Isth*.4.58b = *Aeth*.fr.6).<sup>147</sup> From this scholiastic citation, scholars have argued that Pindar is making a direct reference to the *Aethiopis*, marking it as familiar to his audience.<sup>148</sup>

However, significant caution is necessary here. First, we should note that Ajax's suicide also featured in the *Little Iliad* (*Il.Parv*.arg.1b). Proclus' summary of the epic does not specify its precise timing, but a nighttime setting is again most plausible: the suicide immediately followed Ajax's maddened attack on the Achaeans' livestock, an event that always takes place at night elsewhere.<sup>149</sup> In his recent case for a specifically Aethiopic reference in *Isthmian* 4,

<sup>144</sup> Cycle: *Il.Parv*.arg.1b, *Aeth*.fr.6. Art: LIMC s.v. 'Aias I', nos.103-141; Finglass (2011) 28-30; §II.3.1: 93.

<sup>145</sup> Spelman (2018b) §1n.36

<sup>146</sup> *Ov.Met*.13.386-92: Ajax commits suicide immediately after losing his verbal duel with Odysseus; *Quint.Smyrn*.5.352-485: Ajax's revenge attempt and suicide take place shortly after dawn (5.395-403).

<sup>147</sup> On ὄρθρος: Wallace (1989); Davies (2016) 83.

<sup>148</sup> Nisetich (1989) 11; Spelman (2018a) 52, (2018b) §1.

<sup>149</sup> Cf. *Soph*.Aj.21 (νυκτὸς...τῆσδε); *Quint.Smyrn*.5.395-403 (as dawn rises); *Apollod.Epit*.5.6 (νύκτωρ). Notably, Apollodorus' *Epitome* shares other significant links with the *Little Iliad* (esp. Ajax's burial in a coffin: *Epit*.5.7 ~ *Il.Parv*.fr.3).

Spelman dismisses this possibility, considering it ‘significant’ that the scholia only invoke the *Aethiopis* as Pindaric precedent, with no mention of the *Little Iliad*.<sup>150</sup> But such an argument from silence is dangerous, especially when discussing ancient habits of scholarly citation, which – just as today – were never exhaustive. Moreover, there are good grounds for supposing that Sophocles’ daytime suicide may have been a specific innovation of the tragic stage, dependent on the restrictions of tragic staging and the common dramatic motif of a ‘single day’ of action.<sup>151</sup> It is thus plausible that the traditional epic version of the myth included a night-time hunt and nocturnal suicide, and that it was only the lasting influence of Sophocles’ play that overrode this tradition. After all, even in the Sophoclean drama, Ajax’s failed attempt to take revenge on the Greek commanders (which likely derives from the *Little Iliad*) took place during the night (νυκτὸς...τῆσδε, *Aj.*21-22).<sup>152</sup> It is only the suicide that is delayed into the next day, to allow a protracted exploration of its consequences.<sup>153</sup> The *Aethiopis*’ late-night suicide may well not be as distinctive as scholars assume.

On this occasion, therefore, I do not think our evidence is sufficient to argue for a specific intertextual link. A precise epic may be intended, but on current evidence, it would be overly rash to argue for a direct link with the *Aethiopis* over the *Little Iliad*.<sup>154</sup> The most we can

---

<sup>150</sup> Spelman (2018b) §1n.36.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. Finglass (2011) 39. Sophocles may have been pre-empted by Aeschylus’ *Thracian Women* (fr.83-85; cf. fr.dub.451q), but the suicide in that play was reported in a messenger speech (fr.83), which would have offered more flexibility in timing. For the significance of ‘today’ in tragedy: West (1987) 184; Austin – Olson (2004) 76; cf. *Aj.*131-32, 753, 756, 778.

<sup>152</sup> Finglass (2011) 38-39.

<sup>153</sup> If this were a Sophoclean invention, the opening of the play would be all the more pointed. Odysseus is hunting Ajax’s tracks at dawn, the very time that Ajax traditionally killed himself. The audience might then wonder whether Odysseus will find Ajax on the point of suicide, or even already dead.

<sup>154</sup> It is true that the preceding verses (*Isth.*4.34-35) may allude to Odysseus’ defeat of Ajax in a contest of words for Achilles’ armour, a version which would certainly disagree with the *Little Iliad*, in which the contest was decided by eavesdropping on the opinion of Trojan girls (*Il.Parv.*fr.2). But all we know of the *Aethiopis* is that a στάσις arose between Achilles and Odysseus (*Aeth.*arg.4d); we do not know how it was resolved. Davies (1989) 57-58, (2016) 79-81 suspects that the *Aethiopis* followed the version in which Trojan prisoners testified (cf. *Σ Od.*11.547). In any case, most scholars suspect that Pindar’s version was his own or at least a later invention: Burnett (2005)



plausibly say is that Pindar is evoking his audience's knowledge of the epic tradition, whether or not he has a specific text in mind. In any case, the subsequent verses' celebration of Ajax's enduring fame through Homeric verse (*Isth.*4.37-42) may well attach these epic traditions to the Homeric canon.<sup>155</sup> By stressing Ajax's honour 'among mankind' (τετίμακεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, 37), Pindar emphasises the hero's reception among a range of poetic audiences.<sup>156</sup> The universalising and communal aspect of this noun looks back to Pindar's opening appeal to his audience's knowledge (ἴστε), reinforced by the emphatic μάν.<sup>157</sup>

Such appeal to group knowledge may well build on Homeric poetry: there too, speakers frequently addressed the knowledge of the whole community (e.g. *Il.*2.301, 9.35-36, 10.250, 20.203), a knowledge which – as we have seen – often extends to that of Homer's own audiences. In Pindar's lyric, however, this appeal to his audience's collective knowledge has become more pointed: through the second person plural verb, he addresses them directly.

Pindar's only other use of the expression ἴστε μάν occurs in the closely related *Isthmian* 3 and bears a similar indexical force. He claims that his audience 'know the **ancient** fame of Cleonymus with chariots' (*Isth.*3.13-16):

ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετάν  
σύμφυτον οὐ κατελέγχει.  
ἴστε μάν Κλεωνύμου  
δόξαν παλαιὰν ἄρμασιν·

The relation between this poem and *Isthmian* 4 has been long debated. Uniquely in Pindar's corpus, these two poems address the same victor in the same metre, which has prompted some

---

173; Rutherford (2015) 454-55. The allusion to the contest of words, then, does not support a direct link with the *Aethiopsis*.

<sup>155</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1884) 352; Burkert (1987) 46; Spelman (2018b) §1. Others argue for a contrast between Ajax's ignominious end in the *Aethiopsis* and his celebrated reputation in the *Iliad*: Nisetich (1989) 12; Willcock (1995) 79-80.

<sup>156</sup> For ἀνθρώποι as a poetic audience: §II.2.2: 67-68.

<sup>157</sup> On this particle: Hummel (1993) 404.

scholars to join them.<sup>158</sup> However, most scholars now accept their independence on a variety of metrical and structural grounds: *Isthmian* 3 was composed for a chariot victory at Nemea, shortly after Melissus' earlier success in the Isthmian Games, celebrated in *Isthmian* 4.<sup>159</sup> When Pindar mentions 'twin prizes' in *Isth.*3.9 (καὶ διδύμων ἀέθλων), he thus refers to the two crowns that Melissus has won (στεφάνους, 3.11), as well as the pair of poems which celebrate these achievements (cf. ὑμνῆσαι, 3.7; ἀγαναῖς χαρίτεσσιν, 3.8). In the verses quoted above, however, Pindar looks beyond these two victories to the larger reputation of Melissus' ancestors for chariot victories. This is again marked as something with which Pindar's audience should already be familiar (ἴστε μάν). And here too, it seems that they would have been: *Isthmian* 4 had already recalled the 'ancient fame' of his clan, the Cleonymidae (φάμαν παλαιάν, *Isth.*4.22), a fame which Pindar there specified as deriving from earlier chariot victories (*Isth.*4.25-27):

ἄ τε κὰν γουνοῖς Ἀθανᾶν ἄρμα καρύξαισα νικᾶν  
 ἔν τ' Ἀδραστείοις ἀέθλοις Σικυῶνος ὥπασεν  
 τοιάδε τῶν τότε ἑόντων φύλλ' αἰοδᾶν.

It is likely that the 'leaves of song' (φύλλ' αἰοδᾶν, *Isth.*4.27) mentioned here are the source of the knowledge that Pindar invokes in *Isthmian* 3, especially given the verbal echoes between these passages (δόξαν παλαιάν ἄρμασιν, *Isth.*3.16 ~ φάμαν παλαιάν, *Isth.*4.22, ἄρμα *Isth.*4.25). Pindar expects his audience to be familiar with this family's reputation from its earlier poetic celebrations, whether composed by Pindar himself or another epinician poet.<sup>160</sup> In *Isthmian* 3, the emphatic ἴστε μάν gestures indexically to this poetic precedent, reinforced by the adjective παλαιάν, which further emphasises the antiquity of this fame – it is an

<sup>158</sup> E.g. Segal (1981) 69-70.

<sup>159</sup> On the relationship of *Isthmians* 3 and 4: Köhnken (1971) 87-94; Hamilton (1974) 111; Lidov (1974); Willcock (1995) 69-71; Cole (2003); Barrett (2007b) 162-7. *Isthmian* 4 may have also celebrated a chariot victory: Privitera (1978-79).

<sup>160</sup> Such 'leaves of song' could have come from earlier in Pindar's own career, as Spelman (2018a) 32 assumes: his earliest dated poem is *Pyth.*10 (498 BCE). But we could equally imagine the work of another poet: Farnell (1932) 348 ('an epinician poem'); Nisetich (1989) 76n.15 ('poetry').

established feature of the epinician canon. By indexing this precedent through the plural ἵστε, Pindar again evokes his audience's communal, shared knowledge of tradition.

This emphasis on audience's collective knowledge of tradition is a recurring feature of Pindar's poetics.<sup>161</sup> In fr.188, the poet claims that 'you recognise the well-known song of Polymnestus, the man from Colophon' (φθέγμα μὲν πάγκοινον ἔγνωκας Πολυμνάστου Κολοφωνίου ἀνδρός). Unlike our previous examples, he employs a singular verb (ἔγνωκας, perhaps directed to a specific addressee), but the communality of this knowledge is still conveyed by the adjective πάγκοινον: the poet's song is 'common to all'.<sup>162</sup> In *Isthmian* 2, meanwhile, Pindar claims that Thrasybulus' family is 'not unfamiliar' with epinician poetry (οὐκ ἀγνώτες, *Isth.*2.30-32), a litotic expression which underscores how frequently the Emmenidae were recipients of poetic praise (cf. εὐδόξων...ἀνδρῶν, *Isth.*2.34).<sup>163</sup> Indeed, this claim concludes a list of Xenocrates' earlier victories which had begun with a similar reference to a 'not unknown' Isthmian chariot victory (οὐκ ἄγνωτ', *Isth.*2.12-13), a phrase which may again look to earlier literary celebrations of former achievements.<sup>164</sup> The emphatically repeated litotes reinforces the sense that Pindar's audience, too, should be familiar with these events from earlier song.

Such appeal to audience's collective knowledge of tradition is not restricted to Pindar, however. We can already find earlier precedent in one of Tyrtaeus' elegiac exhortations to the Spartans. Tyrtaeus remarks that his audience, the 'stock of unconquered Heracles' (Ἡρακλῆος...ἀνικῆτου γένος, fr.11.1), are familiar with the horrors of war (fr.11.7-8):

<sup>161</sup> In addition to the below, cf. γινώσκομεν, *Pyth.*3.114 on Nestor and Sarpedon: §II.3.1: 92, Spelman (2018a) 106-7.

<sup>162</sup> On Polymnestus: *Alcm.*fr.114; *Ar.Eq.*1287; *Plut.Mor.*1132d, 1133a, 1134b-d, 1141b.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Pindar's previous ode for Xenocrates (*Pythian* 6, cf. *Isth.*2.18-19), Pindar's poems for Xenocrates' brother Theron (*Olympians* 2 and 3, cf. *Isth.*2.23-29), and possibly a Simonidean ode for Xenocrates (513): Spelman (2018a) 226.

<sup>164</sup> Cf. Spelman (2018a) 271n.45. Contrast Pavese (1966) 111, who takes the adjective proleptically, referring to the fame the present poem will bestow. But the list seems to refer to a string of Xenocrates' past victories which had likely already been celebrated elsewhere: see n.163 above.

ἴσ τε γὰρ ὡς Ἄρεος πολυδακρύου ἔργ' ἀΐδηλα,  
 εὖ δ' ὀργὴν ἐδάητ' ἀργαλέου πολέμου,

They ‘**know** how destructive the deeds of woeful Ares are’, and ‘**have learned** well the nature of grim war’. As with the personal memories of Sappho and Alcaeus, one could argue that such knowledge derives purely from private experience of battle in seventh century Sparta, in the midst of the second Messenian war. However, a close examination of the language of this couplet highlights that the knowledge which Tyrtaeus presupposes is simultaneously that of the literary tradition. War (πόλεμος) is indeed ἀργαλέος in both Homer and Hesiod (*Il.*14.187, *Od.*24.531; *Hes.Op.*229), while the epithet ἀΐδηλος is particularly associated with Ares and warfare in archaic epic, emphasising the god’s destructive capacity to render life ‘unseen’ (ἀΐδηλον Ἄρηα, *Od.*8.309; γένευσ ὦδ’ ἀΐδηλος, *Il.*5.897).<sup>165</sup> The only pre-Tyrtaean instance of πολυδάκρυος, meanwhile, is its sole appearance in the *Iliad*, where it again describes war (μάχης πολυδακρύου, *Il.*17.192). It might be a step too far to see Tyrtaeus here alluding meaningfully and intentionally to a Homeric *hapax legomenon* in the manner of a Hellenistic poet, but even so, this precedent indicates that Tyrtaeus’ audience would have been familiar with the destructive aspect of war not only from life, but also from its literary manifestations. After all, even a local Spartan audience with little exposure to poetry beyond their hometown would still be familiar with the horrors of the literary battlefield, not only from Tyrtaeus’ own works, but also from Spartan epicists such as Cinaethon.<sup>166</sup> As in Pindar’s appeals to audience’s knowledge, Tyrtaeus here evokes his audience’s familiarity with the wider literary tradition.

Such appeals to audience knowledge thus gestured to traditions of myth and poetry with which they would be familiar, against which the poet could situate his own work. But as with indexical hearsay in lyric, this appeal to audience knowledge could also invite audiences to supplement a myth with their broader familiarity of tradition. In Bacchylides’ ninth

<sup>165</sup> Cf. *Il.*5.757, where ἔργ' ἀΐδηλα is a variant reading for Ares’ behaviour, in verse-final position as here: Christensen (2012).

<sup>166</sup> On Cinaethon: Huxley (1969) 85-9; Tsagalis (2017) 175-96. His date is uncertain: Eusebius dates him to the mid-eighth century (*Chron.Ol.*4.2), but Huxley (1969) 87 suspects a post-Tyrtaean date around 625 BCE, or even as late as 550 BCE.

epinician, for example, a poem composed for the Phliasian athlete Automedes, the poet opens an allusive catalogue of Asopus' daughters by appealing to his audience's knowledge (Bacchyl. 9.47-56):

στείχει δι' εὐρείας κελε[ύ]θου  
**μυρία** πάντα **φάτις**  
 σᾶς γενεᾶς λιπαροζώνων  
 θυγατρῶν, ἅς θε[ο]ί  
 σὺν τύχαις ὤικισσαν ἀρχαγούς  
 ἀπορθήτων ἀγνιᾶν.  
**τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν** κυανοπλοκάμου  
 Θήβας ἐϋδμα[τον πόλι]ν,  
 ἧ τὰν **μεγαλῶνυ]μον** Αἰγιναν, μεγ[ίστ]ου  
 Ζην]ὸς [ἃ πλαθεῖσα λ]έχει τέκεν ἥρω

After commencing here with Thebes and Aegina, the subsequent fragmentary lines appear to mention Aegina's son Aeacus (father of Peleus and Telamon) and continue with a list of other Asopids, before ending in a closural ring composition (9.64-65). The opening emphasis on the family's fame and renown (esp. **μυρία...φάτις**) emphasises the traditionality of the catalogue that follows, a familiarity that is reinforced by Bacchylides' appeal to the audience's knowledge. The rhetorical question ('**Who does not know...**?') implies that everyone is expected to be familiar with this myth.<sup>167</sup> And indeed, the list of Asopus' daughters, all of whom had been wooed by gods and became the eponyms of cities, appears to have been an established legend. A fragment of Corinna offers a similar list of nine Asopids, containing much overlap with Bacchylides (654 col.ii-iv *PMG*).<sup>168</sup> And as Cairns has argued, both Corinna and Bacchylides seem to be following an earlier version of the myth, perhaps that by the Corinthian Eumelus or the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*.<sup>169</sup> We know, moreover, that an Asopid ancestry was an important feature of the Phliasians' local mythology, and part of a larger

<sup>167</sup> Cf. Berman (2015) 56: 'The line...reveals a poet aware of his epic predecessors'.

<sup>168</sup> On Corinna's catalogue: Larson (2002).

<sup>169</sup> Cairns (2010) 262. Eumelus: Bowra (1938). On the Asopids in the *Catalogue*: West (1985) 100-103, 162-64; Cardin (2010). Nagy (2011) similarly suspects that the *Catalogue* influenced Pindar's Aeginetan odes.

debate as to whether the ancestor of these illustrious city-nymphs was the Asopus in Boeotia or its namesake in Phliasian territory.<sup>170</sup> As part of their claim, the Phliasians dedicated both a statue group of Zeus and Aegina in Delphi (Paus.10.13.6) and a group of Zeus, Asopus and five Asopids (including Thebes) at Olympia (Paus.5.22.6). In asking who is not familiar with these famous cities and their Asopid ancestry, Bacchylides thus indexes his engagement with a familiar and politically charged local myth.

Besides evoking a well-known myth, this invitation for an audience to recall their knowledge of the Asopids also invites them to supplement the bare details that Bacchylides offers, especially in relation to the first one he names: Thebes. The city is described here as ‘well-built’ (ἐϋδμα[τον], 54) and introduced as an example of ‘unsacked streets’ (ἀπορρήτων ἀγυιῶν, 52). The earlier part of Bacchylides’ poem had already recalled the failed expedition of the Seven against Thebes (9.10-20), an event which on the face of it reinforces this assessment: the city stood strong and repulsed its assailants.<sup>171</sup> But any mention of the expedition of the Seven cannot fail to evoke thoughts of its sequel, the successful sacking of the city by the Epigonoι (SIV.2.3: 204-6). In appealing to his audience’s knowledge of the myth, Bacchylides’ silence on this point resonates all too loudly. ‘Yes’, we are invited to reply, ‘we do know what happened at Thebes’.<sup>172</sup> Scholars have seen a political purpose underlying this suppression of the Epigonoι myth, a way to downplay and negate Argive achievement while simultaneously ‘super-imposing a skewed pro-Phliasian genealogy’ onto Thebes.<sup>173</sup> But despite the explicit silence, the poet’s nod to his audience’s knowledge gives space for the lingering shadow of tradition to rear its head, undermining any simple patriotism.

Indexical appeals to audience knowledge, just like indexical hearsay, therefore, can invite audiences to fill in the gaps of a story with their knowledge of tradition, complicating a simple treatment of myth by evoking elements that remain untold.

---

<sup>170</sup> Larson (2001) 138-42, 303n.44; Fearn (2003) 358-62; Paus.2.5.2 (Phliasians vs. Thebans). Σ(D) II.1.180 offers a compromise.

<sup>171</sup> The two passages are tied by a verbal echo: ἀγ[υιάς] (9.17) ~ ἀγυιῶν (9.52); Fearn (2003) 360.

<sup>172</sup> Cf. Fearn (2003) 360; Cairns (2010) 262.

<sup>173</sup> Fearn (2003) 360-1; cf. Cairns (2010) 261.

### III.4 Conclusions

In the foregoing discussion, we have seen that memory and knowledge both functioned as significant indexes of allusion in archaic Greek poetry. Their presence is most clear in Homeric epic, where characters repeatedly urge their interlocutors to recall earlier events of tradition, simultaneously inviting Homer's audiences to recall their own knowledge of the mythical past. In many ways, this indexical device is a foil and complement to indexical hearsay: whereas the latter evokes external traditions that are circulating on the airwaves of *fama*, ready to be picked up by observant listeners, indexical memory and knowledge involve a more internal and personal act of preserving, retaining and transmitting knowledge. But as with hearsay, these metaphors of allusion are an apt model for the nature and process of poetic composition and performance.

We must acknowledge, however, the limits of this indexical mode in archaic Greek poetry. We have identified and discussed numerous cases in Homer, but relatively few in the rest of early Greek epic and archaic lyric. The extremely fragmentary state of much of our evidence must play some role in this, but it is striking that even in Pindar's completely extant epinicians and Hesiod's extant didactic works, poetic memory is not as productive. As we have already noted, the principal reason for this seems to be the way in which these poems treat myth, and their relative dearth of character speech. Lyric poets in particular rarely tell a mythical narrative in its own right, but rather introduce one as an exemplum or point of comparison for events of the real world. When we return to the mimetic world of tragedy, it is perhaps no surprise that cases of indexical memory appear to flourish once more.<sup>174</sup> Indexical knowledge, by contrast, is able to play a more active role in lyric poetry, especially when the poet directly addresses his audience, but even so, the phenomenon is less pervasive than in Homer.

---

<sup>174</sup> Currie (2016) 139 cites a few examples (Soph.*Aj.*1273-87 ~ *Il.*7, 15, 18; Eur.*Hec.*239-248 ~ *Od.*4.244-58; *IA.*337-60 ~ *ad hoc* invention?). Cf. too e.g. Eur.*Tro.*69-70 ~ *Il.**Pers.*arg.3a; Eur.*Hec.*107-115 ~ *Hec.*37-41, Soph.*Polyxena* (frr.522-28).

Nevertheless, the foregoing examples demonstrate the extent to which this allusive index was already deeply engrained in Greek poetry from the very beginning, especially in Homer. The device was primarily used to gesture to and incorporate other mythical narratives, marking the poet's mastery of tradition. But we have also noted cases of misremembering, where a character's memory is pointedly selective, inviting audiences to fill in the gaps. In both cases, the device evokes wider traditions, within which each poet situates himself and his own work.



## **PART IV.**

### **TIME FOR ALLUSION**



## IV.1 Introduction

In this final section, we are concerned with the allusive potential of time: the way in which literary references to the past and future situate a poem within its larger tradition. Essentially, this index embraces a number of complementary and closely related concepts: first, broad chronological perspective – an awareness of earlier and later events which lie beyond the immediate narrative; second, marked iteration – a specific sense of literary déjà vu and cyclical repetition; and third, epigonal self-consciousness – an explicit concern with one's poetic predecessors. All three are frequently cited as indexes of allusion in Hellenistic and Roman poetry, but here I shall highlight their considerable presence in archaic Greek poetics.

The first phenomenon (chronological perspective) involves poets self-consciously acknowledging the larger tradition beyond their immediate narrative. This is often achieved through the use of temporal adverbs and adjectives, especially those that look to the past, like *ποτέ* and *quondam*, or *παλαιός* and *antiquus*. Such 'explicit pointers of pastness' knowingly nod to the mythical and poetic past, signposting a reference to other stories and other texts which treat them.<sup>1</sup> But we also encounter cases which emphasise a greater deal of continuity or change with the past, as when Ovid's Achaemenides is 'no longer' roughly clad, as he had been in Virgil's *Aeneid* (*iam non*, *Met.*14.165 ~ *Aen.*3.590-94).<sup>2</sup> In each case, the specific episode in question is situated within the larger span of literary history.

The second technique (marked iteration) involves poets self-reflexively replaying or foreshadowing another event from the poetic tradition in the present. We have already encountered the Ovidian Ariadne's repetition of her Catullan self (*iterum, nunc quoque*, §I.1.2: 8-9), but we could equally add Ovid's Cydippe in the *Heroides*, who finds herself 'now

---

<sup>1</sup> Quotation: Lightfoot (2014) 171. E.g. Virg.*Aen.*2.272 (*quondam*) ~ *Il.*22.395-405 (Currie (2016) 139n.177); *Aen.*12.347-49 (*antiqui, referens, quondam*) ~ *Il.*10.314-27 (Tarrant (2012) 177). [Mosch.]*Epitaph.Bion.*68-69 (*πρώαν*) ~ Bion *Epitaph.Adon.*13-14; Arat.*Phaen.*99-116 (*ἀρχαῖον, πάρος, ποτ', ἀρχαίων, παλαιών*) ~ Hesiod *Theog.*378-82, *Op.*106-201 (Gee (2013) 24); cf. *φασίν*, *Phaen.*98; *λόγος...ἄλλος*, *Phaen.*100 (~ *ἕτερόν...λόγον*, *Op.*106).

<sup>2</sup> Hinds (1998) 113; §I.1.2: 9-10.

**too'** reading the words written by Acontius (*nunc quoque*, *Her.*21.110, cf. 20.216), just as Acontius finds himself writing **'again'** like his Callimachean incarnation (*en iterum scribo*, *Her.*20.35 ~ *Aet.*3.frr.67-75).<sup>3</sup> In Theocritus' first *Idyll*, meanwhile, Daphnis dismissively bids Aphrodite go to Diomedes **'again'**, recalling her previous support of the hero in the *Iliad* (**αὖτις**, *Id.*1.112 ~ *Il.*5.335-430).<sup>4</sup> All these examples involve the self-conscious replay of an earlier episode from each character's fictional life, while also echoing an earlier literary treatment of that same episode.<sup>5</sup>

The final category (epigonal self-consciousness) involves cases where characters and narrators explicitly appeal to their ancestors and predecessors, constructing an explicit map of literary history. In Theocritus' sixteenth *Idyll*, the poet establishes himself in a continuum with his encomiastic predecessors by recalling how former poets celebrated the battles of **'men of old'** to preserve their memory, setting himself on a par with the likes of Homer and Simonides of Ceos (φυλόπιδας **προτέρων** ὑμνησαν αἰοιδοί, *Id.*16.50). Nor is his subject inferior to those of his predecessors: Hieron is an equal match to the **'heroes of old'** (**προτέροις** ἴσος ἡρώεσσι, *Id.*16.80). The prologue of Philip's *Garland*, meanwhile, establishes his collection of epigrams as a self-conscious sequel to that of Meleager. The poet begins by contrasting his addressee's **'knowledge'** of the **'fame of the ancients'** (παλαιότερων εἰδὼς κλέος, *AP* 4.2.5) with the brevity of the younger generation whose poems he has assembled (γνῶθι καὶ ὀπλοτέρων τὴν ὀλιγοστιχίην, *AP* 4.2.6), acknowledging the precedent and tradition within which he

---

<sup>3</sup> Barchiesi (2001) 120.

<sup>4</sup> Currie (2016) 188. Cf. Asclepiades 15.4 *HE* = *AP.*12.46.4 (ὥς τὸ πάρος) ~ *Anac.*fr.398; *Ap.*Rhod.*Argon.*3.117-24.

<sup>5</sup> Such allusions can even disrupt the strict chronology of the mythical world to reflect that of literary history. In Apollonius' *Argonautica*, Jason and Medea visit Circe and Alcinoüs 'before' Odysseus in their world but 'after' the *Odyssey* from the perspective of literary history: *Arg.*4.667 (πάρος) ~ *Od.*10.213, 235-36, 393-94; *Arg.*4.1068 (ὥς το παροῖθεν) ~ *Od.*7.346-7 (Hunter (2015) 174-75, 228). Cf. 'future reflexive' allusions in Roman poetry: Barchiesi (1993).

works.<sup>6</sup> Through such explicit acknowledgement of predecessors, poets constructed their own literary history.<sup>7</sup>

These temporal tropes have been well-studied in Hellenistic, Roman and later poetry, but they have rarely received any attention in archaic or classical Greek poetry.<sup>8</sup> Yet there is considerable evidence that the Greeks conceived of literature in temporal terms, at least by the classical period: authors refer intratextually to ‘earlier’ and ‘later’ parts of their own works,<sup>9</sup> and label pre-existing traditions as ‘prior’ and ‘old’.<sup>10</sup> As in the previous sections, here too I argue that there are strong grounds for dating this temporal conception of poetic production back to the archaic age.

---

<sup>6</sup> The opposition of ancient/recent is not straightforward, however: ὀλιγοστιχίην recalls a buzzword of Callimachus, one of the Meleagrian ‘ancients’ (~ [ὀλ]ιγόστιχος, *Aet.*fr.1.9): Magnelli (2006) 394-96. Note Philip’s further string of indexes: knowledge (εἰδώς), fame (κλέος), recognition (γνώθι), addition (καί).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Hinds (1998) 52-144 on Roman poets’ ‘do-it-yourself’ literary histories.

<sup>8</sup> The most notable exception is Torrance (2013) 194-97, 219-33, 292-94 on doubleness and novelty in Euripides (δεύτερος, δισσός, καινός); cf. McDermott (2000). Currie (2016) makes occasional reference to Homeric examples (index, s.v. ‘words of iteration’).

<sup>9</sup> E.g. ὥς καὶ πρῶην εἵπομεν, *Arist.Eth.Nic.*2.3.1104b18; ὥς μικρὸν πρόσθεν ἡμῖν λέλεκται, *Apollod.Bibl.*3.12.5.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. τὰ παλαιά, *Ar.Eccl.*580.



## IV.2 Epic Temporalities

It has long been recognised that Homeric epic manipulates time in complex and sophisticated ways, allusively re-enacting events beyond the strict confines of its narrative.<sup>11</sup> Such replays of tradition ‘out of sequence’ are especially visible in the *Iliad*. The first half of the poem involves many elements which closely rerun the opening stages of the war: the catalogue of ships, the *teichoscopia*, the duel of Paris and Menelaus, the encounter of Paris and Helen, the marshalling of troops and Pandarus’ truce-breaking – these all re-perform acts that logically ‘fit’ the first, rather than tenth, year of the war.<sup>12</sup> In the second half of the poem, meanwhile, the poet allusively foreshadows what is to come: Patroclus’ death prefigures Achilles’ own,<sup>13</sup> while the hero’s funeral games reflect many later episodes of the tradition. Ajax and Odysseus’ inconclusive wrestling match foreshadows the ‘Judgement of Arms’ (*Il.*23.708-35 ~ *Aeth.arg.*4d, *Il.Parv.arg.*1a); Epeius’ physical frailty looks ahead to his use of brains, not brawn, in constructing the Trojan horse (23.670 ~ *Od.*8.493, 11.523, *Il.Parv.arg.*4a); and Locrian Ajax’s divinely induced slip in the footrace serves as a proleptic punishment for his future transgression against Athena by raping Cassandra (23.774, 782 ~ *Il.Pers.arg.*3a).<sup>14</sup> Within its own narrow chronology, Homer’s epic embodies the whole Trojan war *fabula*.

Within such a context of temporal manipulation, it is unsurprising to find that references to time frequently bear an indexical significance in Homeric epic, in the mouths of

---

<sup>11</sup> Schein (1984) 19-28; Kullmann (2001) 388-89; Burgess (2006) 167-69; de Jong (2007). This phenomenon was already recognised by Aristotle (Else (1957) 585-86: *Poet.*23.1459a34-36) and Eustathius (Rengakos (2004) 292). On the *Iliad*’s temporal self-referentiality, cf. Christensen (2015b).

<sup>12</sup> Bowra (1930) 110-13; Whitman (1958) 265, 269-70; Edwards (1987) 188-97; Taplin (1992) 83-109. Paris and Helen: Reinhardt (1938); Hunter (2018) 71-75. Cf. Finkelberg (2002) on *Iliad* 7 evoking Protesilaus and Cynus (*Cypr.arg.*10a-b).

<sup>13</sup> E.g. Burgess (2009) 72-97.

<sup>14</sup> Whitman (1958) 263-64; Kullmann (1960) 333-35, 350, 356; Willcock (1973); Richardson (1993) 202-3; Rengakos (2007) 107-8. Forte (2017) 65-104 attractively argues that the finishing order of the foot and chariot races rank the time and distance of characters’ *nostoi* in the Cyclic tradition.

both the narrator and his characters. In the following sections, we shall explore the rich Homeric evidence for the first two categories of temporal indexes (chronological perspective: §IV.2.1; and marked iteration: §IV.2.2), before exploring the phenomenon in the wider corpus of archaic Greek epic and asking whether Homeric epic exhibits any kind of epigonal self-consciousness (§IV.2.3). Homer makes no direct mention of his poetic πρότεροι, but I shall argue that he does so indirectly through the voices of his characters. By means of these devices, he situates his poem within the larger temporal waves of myth and literary history, foreshadowing the allusive techniques of later periods.

### IV.2.1 Pointers to the Past

In both Homeric epics, the narrator and his characters repeatedly evoke other moments of tradition through a temporal lens. We have already witnessed the Iliadic recollection of Aeneas' flight before Achilles on Mt. Ida, cued in part through temporal references (ἤδη...καὶ ἄλλοτε, *Il.*20.90, *Il.*20.187, §III.2.1: 135-37), as well as Antinous' comparison of Penelope in the *Odyssey* to the Achaean women 'of old' who lived 'long ago' (παλαιῶν...πάρως, *Od.*2.118-9, §II.2.2: 71-76). Yet the examples can be multiplied many times over: temporally-charged adverbs (αἰεὶ, ἄλλοτε, αὖ, αὖτις, ἤδη, οὐποτε, πάλαι, πάλιν, πάρως, ποτέ, πρόσθεν) and adjectives (ἄλλος, παλαιός, πρότερος) frequently mark references to other stories and traditions, both inter- and intra-textually.<sup>15</sup>

On an intratextual level, these temporal indexes mark the larger structuring and connections across a poem, in the same manner as characters' intratextual reminiscences. Such cross-references can be small-scale, as when Chryses prays to Apollo and recalls the god's previous fulfilment of his prayer earlier within the very same book (ἤδη...ποτ'...πάρως, *Il.*1.453 ~ *Il.*1.35-52); the emphatic accumulation of temporal indexes reinforces the sense of

---

<sup>15</sup> Generally, cf. Kullmann (1960) 386.



repetition, as the priest invokes the god in the very same terms (*Il.*1.37-38=1.451-52). In the *Odyssey*, meanwhile, the tears which Odysseus sheds when reunited with his son are contrasted with his earlier behaviour, when he had ‘**previously** always restrained them’ (**πάρως**, *Od.*16.191), recalling an earlier episode within the same book: Telemachus’ initial appearance at Eumaeus’ hut, when Odysseus did indeed refrain from tears, and it was Eumaeus who played the paternal role, bursting into tears and embracing him as a father does an only son (*Od.*16.16-21).<sup>16</sup>

Such temporal markers can also function on a far larger scale, tying together disparate parts of whole epics: before he sends Patroclus out to battle, Achilles invokes Zeus as Chryses had Apollo, recalling the previous occasion when the god listened to his prayer (**ποτ’**, *Il.*16.236). On this occasion, the hero makes a more distant cross-reference to the first book of the poem, when Zeus accepted his wishes, as mediated by Thetis; hymnic *hypomnesis* coincides with intratextual recollection (*Il.*1.393-412, 503-510). In the chariot race of *Iliad* 23, meanwhile, Diomedes lines up with the horses of Tros, which we are reminded he had earlier taken from Aeneas, although Apollo had saved the hero – a transparent cross-reference to the events of *Iliad* 5 (**ποτ’**, *Il.*23.291-92 ~ *Il.*5.318-27, 344-46).<sup>17</sup> And at the hinge of the *Odyssey*, the narrator remarks that the hero who had previously (**πρίν**) suffered at sea now sleeps in peace, forgetful of all that he had suffered (**λελασμένος**, *Od.*13.90-2). As scholars have long recognised, this statement marks the transition from the first to second half of the *Odyssey*, as the poet leaves behind the hero’s adventures and wandering, a transition here marked as an act of forgetting. The hero’s ‘previous’ suffering at sea epitomises the action of the whole first half of the poem, but it looks particularly to the language of the Odyssean proem, of which verse 90 is a near-quotation (ἄνδρα ... ὅς πρίν μὲν μάλα πολλὰ πάθ’ ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν, | ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρω, *Od.*13.89-91 ~ ἄνδρα...ὅς μάλα πολλὰ | πλάγχθη, *Od.*1.1-2; πολλὰ δ’ ὅ γ’ ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν, *Od.*1.4).<sup>18</sup> Through these close verbal echoes and the indexical language of temporality and forgetting, the narrator recalls the

<sup>16</sup> Rutherford (1986) 157; de Jong (1994) 37; Currie (2016) 132.

<sup>17</sup> Currie (2016) 142.

<sup>18</sup> Bowie (2013) 111, cf. 2-6.

very start of the poem in a closural ring composition, marking the return to Ithaca as a fresh start. On a miniature scale, then, these temporal indexes signpost intratextual cross-references across individual poems, inviting audiences to situate the present events against the literary past.

In the same way, temporal markers also point to events beyond the scope of each poem, positioning the poet's work against the larger corpus of myth. As with indexical memory, the cued references are often directed at other moments of the Trojan war *fabula*. In *Iliad* 3, for example, Antenor introduces his recollection of the embassy of Odysseus and Menelaus with a temporal reference (ἤδη...ποτ', *Il.*3.205-8):

ἤδη γὰρ καὶ δεῦρό ποτ' ἦλυθε δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς  
σεῦ ἔνεκ' ἀγγελίης σὺν ἀρηϊφίλῳ Μενελάῳ·  
τοὺς δ' ἐγὼ ἐξείνισσα καὶ ἐν μεγάροισι φίλησα,  
ἀμφοτέρων δὲ φυὴν ἐδάην καὶ μήδεα πυκνά.

This embassy is another episode familiar from the *Cypria* (arg.10c), but its antiquity is suggested by its apparent depiction on a bronze tripod leg at Olympia from the last quarter of the seventh century,<sup>19</sup> as well another mention later in the *Iliad*, when Agamemnon kills two sons of a certain Antimachus, who is said to have been bribed by Paris into refusing the embassy and arguing for the death of the ambassadors (*Il.*11.123-25, 138-41: NB ποτ', 11.139). In Apollodorus' later summary, it is Antenor who saved Odysseus and Menelaus from such Trojan treachery (Apollod.*Epit.*3.28), a detail which may well be implied by the Iliadic prominence of Antenor's personal hosting of the pair, expressed through the emphatic ἐγὼ and first-person verbs in 3.207-8. The temporally marked introduction of Antenor's account invites Homer's audience to recall another episode of Trojan myth, and supplement it with their wider knowledge of tradition: Antenor has every reason to remember the build and character of these two heroes.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup> West (2013) 42.

<sup>20</sup> Kullmann (1960) 275-76; Danek (2005) 19n.41, (2006) 8-9, 20; Currie (2016) 142.

Indeed, the brevity of allusions introduced by temporal indexes frequently invite such supplementation of detail. When Odysseus compares Nausicaa to a palm tree that he ‘**once**’ saw on Delos (**ποτέ**, *Od.*6.160-67), the audience are invited to recall the tradition of the hero’s visit to the island in search of the nourishing daughters of Anius – another episode that featured in the *Cypria* ( $\Sigma$  *Od.*6.164d, *Cypr.*fr.26).<sup>21</sup> In *Iliad* 1, meanwhile, Agamemnon memorably upbraids Calchas as a ‘prophet of evil’ who ‘has **never yet** given a favourable prophecy’ (*Il.*1.106-8). Scholars have long suspected an allusion to the sacrifice of Iphigenia here, the previous occasion on which Calchas gave the ruler some bad news.<sup>22</sup> Such a reference is reinforced by the generalised temporal frame (**οὐ πῶ ποτέ... αἰεὶ...οὔτε τί πω...**), which emphasises the continuity with the mythical past. Besides such references to precise mythical episodes, however, temporal indexes can also gesture to more general elements of tradition: when Odysseus encounters Athena on Ithaca, the hero remarks that the goddess has been kindly to him ‘**in the past**’ while he warred at Troy (**πάρῳ**, *Od.*13.314), just as Locrian Ajax complains in the Patrocleian funeral games that Athena has helped Odysseus, as she has done ‘**previously**’ (**τὸ πάρῳ**, *Il.*23.782-83). Such statements evoke the traditional association of hero and goddess, familiar from many moments in the *Iliad* and elsewhere.<sup>23</sup> Temporal indexes, therefore, mark not only cross-references to earlier moments of an individual work, but also to the wider tradition of Trojan myth.

Yet it is not only events within the Trojan War cycle that are evoked through temporal references: other stories and traditions are also recalled in a similar manner. In the Odyssean *Nekyia*, Odysseus’ encounters with other heroes from other stories are explicitly marked as an engagement with the past. Odysseus’ narrative closes with his hope to see more ‘of the warrior heroes who died **in the days of old**’ (**εἴ τις ἔτ’ ἔλθοι | ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, οἳ δὴ τὸ πρόσθεν ὄλοντο**, *Od.*11.628-29) and ‘the men **of an earlier time**’ (**προτέρους...ἀνέρας**, *Od.*11.630).

<sup>21</sup> Tsagalis (2008) 44-62, noting potential rivalry with an alternative tradition in which Palamedes, not Odysseus, went to Delos ( $\Sigma$  Lycoph.*Alex.*581a: cf. §III.2.3: 146-47 for such rivalry). On the myth in the *Cypria*: Marin (2009); West (2013) 123-25.

<sup>22</sup> Taplin (1992) 86; Dowden (1996) 53; Pulleyn (2000) 156-57; Kullmann (2001) 395-96.

<sup>23</sup> Iliadic examples: Allan (2006) 20n.95.

These statements mark the literary antiquity of the figures he has encountered in the Underworld, who can plausibly be read as representatives of different literary traditions.<sup>24</sup> The emphasis on their antiquity here marks Homer's debt to these pre-existing *fabulae*. Yet it is also significant that the phrase **πρωτέρους...ἀνέρας** in 11.630 is followed in apposition with the name of two specific individuals, Theseus and Pirithous (Θησέα Περύθοόν τε, 11.631). Their presence here was already suspected in antiquity as a Peisistratid interpolation (Plut.*Thes.*20), but from an allusive perspective, the pair are far from out of place. The last hero whom Odysseus actually encounters is Heracles, who recounts his former descent to the Underworld to fetch Cerberus (11.623-26, NB **ποτέ**, 11.623), a narrative which has often been viewed as an implicit signal of Homeric debt to this earlier *katabasis* as a 'model' for Odysseus' current adventure.<sup>25</sup> In particular, Heracles' **καὶ** σύ (11.618) highlights the parallel: Odysseus *too*, just like Heracles, is a man who faces difficult labours (ἀέθλους, *Od.*11.622, ἄεθλον, 11.624; cf. *Od.*1.18, 4.170, 4.241).<sup>26</sup> In this light, Theseus and Pirithous are very well-placed, given the tradition of their own descent to the Underworld in pursuit of Persephone (Hes.fr.280, §II.2.4: 82-83). Having just encountered one of his katabatic predecessors, Odysseus thus hopes to come across two others, a hope which proves unfulfilled but nevertheless highlights the relationship between the *Odyssey* and earlier myth. By mentioning further katabatic predecessors, Homer highlights mythical models for his own hero's Underworld visit.

It is especially the figure of the Iliadic Nestor, however, who is most closely associated with the allusive potential of time. He is introduced as an elder with much experience, who has already (ἤδη) witnessed the passing of two generations of mortals who had been born

<sup>24</sup> Most (1992); Danek (1998) 230-31; cf. §II.2.2: 71n.43.

<sup>25</sup> Currie (2006) 6, 22n.102, (2016) 47; S.R. West (2012) 129. Heracles and Odysseus: §IV.2.3: 207 with n.60.

<sup>26</sup> Finkelberg (1995) 5; Danek (1998) 247-49. Currie (2016) 67n.170 notes the allusive potential of **καὶ** to link a character's fate to his allusive doublet, citing *Il.*23.80 (Achilles–Patroclus: Burgess (2001a) 74) and Eur.*Phoen.*854 (Erectheus ~ Menoeceus: Mastronarde (1994) 399). Cf. *Od.*11.441 (**καὶ** σύ: Agamemnon ~ Odysseus); *Od.*1.301, 3.197, 3.313 (**καὶ** σύ/κεῖνος: Telemachus ~ Orestes); *Od.*13.418 (**καὶ** κεῖνος: Telemachus ~ Odysseus); Soph.*Ant.*944 (ἔτλα **καὶ** Δανάας...φῶς: Antigone ~ Danae); Dioscorides *AP* 7.707.1-2 (**καί**, alongside the language of otherness, ἄλλος, and kinship, αὐθαίμων, marks the epigram's relationship with *AP* 7.37).

long ago (πρόσθεν, *Il.*1.250-52), a characterisation which we have seen was likely traditional, given its apparent evocation in the *Odyssey* (§II.2.1: 65-67). Moreover, his area of expertise is singled out in each epic as events of the past (πάλαι πολέμων ἐϋ εἰδώς, *Il.*4.310; παλαιά τε πολλά τε εἰδώς, *Od.*24.51), and he is even presented as an almost bardic figure: story-telling is his *modus operandi*.<sup>27</sup> When we turn to his numerous Iliadic stories, then, it is significant that they are all tinged with temporal references: the aged hero repeatedly appeals to his former youth and bygone times, highlighting a sense of belatedness and a contrast between the present and past. In *Iliad* 1, his account of his duel with the Centaurs alongside the great heroes of old (1.260-73) is introduced with the phrase ἤδη...ποτ', alongside the qualification that he has never seen nor will ever see such warriors again (1.262) – indeed, no man of the present could even contend with them (1.269-70). His recollection of the time when (ὅτε) he defeated Ereuthalion (*Il.*4.318-21) is prefaced by a remark that men of former times (οἱ πρότεροι, 4.308) also sacked cities and walls with similar intent, and includes a contrast between his past youth and current old age (τότε κοῦρος ἔα, νῦν αὖτε με γῆρας ὀπάζει, 4.321). The longer account of his duel with Ereuthalion (*Il.*7.132-56) is framed by wishes that he were still as young as that time (αἶ γάρ... ἡβῶμ' ὥς ὅτ', 7.132-33; εἴθ' ὥς ἡβώοιμι, 7.157), when he was the youngest of all participants (γενεῇ δὲ νεώτατος ἔσκον ἀπάντων, 7.153). And so too his account of former athletic successes, which is introduced with a similar wish for past youth (εἴθ' ὥς ἡβώοιμι...ὥς ὁπότε, *Il.*23.629-30) and marked by a contrast between past and present (ὥς ποτ' ἔον, 23.643; τότε δ' αὖτε μετέπρεπον ἡρώεσσιν, 23.645); athletic contests are now the preserve of younger men (νῦν αὖτε νεώτεροι, 23.643). Finally, his lengthy account of his former conflicts with the Epeians is similarly introduced with a wish for former youth (εἴθ' ὥς ἡβώοιμι...ὥς ὁπότε, *Il.*11.670-71), and includes Heracles' destruction of Neleus' eleven other sons 'in earlier years' (τῶν προτέρων ἐτέων, *Il.*11.691), cuing yet another episode of myth which appears to have been traditional: Heracles' theomachic battle at Pylos is hinted at elsewhere in the *Iliad* and in other archaic poems, including the Hesiodic *Aspis*, which evokes

<sup>27</sup> Dickson (1995) esp.47-100, Marks (2008) 112-31. Cf. the four stories he tells Menelaus in the *Cypria* (*Cypr.*arg.4b): West (2013) 98-101; Currie (2015) 288; Sammons (2017) 55-61.

the event through a similar temporal reference (ἤδη...καὶ ἄλλοτε, *Scut.*359).<sup>28</sup> Although these reminiscences each have a paradigmatic function within the immediate narrative,<sup>29</sup> they all evoke other traditions attached to Nestor and Pylos. In the past, scholars have plausibly postulated elaborate Pylian epics as Homer's sources,<sup>30</sup> although we would do better to reframe them as traditions or *fabulae*. Nestor's recurring temporal references thus frame his tales as prior traditions, against which Homer situates his own epic, comparing his own characters to the Nestorian and mythical past.

Temporal indexes, therefore, frequently signpost the evocation of another moment of myth, be it an intratextual reference to an earlier part of a single poem, or to the larger traditions against which Homer positions his own epics. Such indexes often convey a sense of continuity (Calchas still utters evil prophecies, Athena still supports Odysseus) or precedent (Odysseus follows in the tracks of Heracles, Theseus and Pirithous). Crucially, as with poetic memory, events both within and beyond a single poem are evoked in a similar manner, suggesting that they are all conceived as a long continuum of myth.

### IV.2.2 Poetic Déjà Vu

In addition to these signalled back-references to earlier traditions and myths, both Homeric poems also exhibit cases of more pointed repetition and iteration – the second category of allusive temporality with which we began. These instances not only evoke an episode of the mythical past, but depict the present as a pointed replay of it, stressing even more clearly the continuity between past and present.

As with broad chronological perspective, this is a phenomenon which works both inter- and intra-textually. As an example of the former, we could cite the frequency with which the

---

<sup>28</sup> *Il.*5.392-402; *Scut.*359-67; *Pind.**Ol.*9.28-35.

<sup>29</sup> Pedrick (1983); Alden (2000) 74-111.

<sup>30</sup> Bölte (1934); Cantieni (1942); Hampe (1950) 28-29n.79; §I.2.1: 31.

*Odyssey* insists that the Phaeacians have ‘**previously**’ escorted men across the sea, an insistence which seems to hint at earlier traditions of their seafaring prowess (ὥς τὸ πάρος περ, 8.31; τὶς ἄλλος, 8.32; καὶ ἄλλους, 16.227-78).<sup>31</sup> As scholars have noted, the Phaeacians are unlikely to be a Homeric invention: the presence of alternative genealogies in Alcaeus (fr.441) and Acusilaus (fr.4 EGM) ‘make it *prima facie* unlikely that they too were only found in Homer in the Archaic period’, while the *Odyssey*’s mixed messages about the role of queen Arete may be indebted to other versions in which she played a more active role in hosting the hero (cf. *Od.*6.303-15, 7.53-77).<sup>32</sup> Earlier in the poem, moreover, Alcinous has already recalled a previous occasion when the Phaeacians transported Rhadamanthys to Euboea (*Od.*7.321-24), a reference which ‘must be to some story created at an earlier stage of the tradition’.<sup>33</sup> The *Odyssey* thus establishes Odysseus’ present voyage as a replay of the Phaeacians’ earlier, traditional escorting of men. Particularly intriguing in this regard, however, is the claim that the Phaeacians who took Odysseus home sailed into Ithaca by the Cave of the Nymphs, a place which they ‘**knew previously**’ (πρὶν εἰδότες, *Od.*13.113). By foregrounding their familiarity with Ithaca, the poet hints again at their traditional role as ferrymen, but perhaps especially at earlier accounts of Odysseus’ return.<sup>34</sup> The Phaeacians have been to Ithaca before, in earlier treatments of Odysseus’ homecoming. Homer thus establishes a strong sense of déjà vu; it would indeed seem that the Phaeacians were ‘**famous for their ships**’ from the larger tradition (ναυσίκλυτοι, *Od.*13.166).

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Currie (2016) 142.

<sup>32</sup> Alternative genealogies: Kelly (forthcoming) n.45; cf. Fowler (2000–13) II.555. Inherited Arete: Hainsworth (1988) 323-24. For discussions of the Phaeacians’ origins and traditionality: Reinhardt (1948) 144-61; Germain (1954) 285-319; Heubeck (1974) 114; Sergent (2002); West (2014a) 129-30.

<sup>33</sup> Garvie (1994) 232. Note φάος, *Od.*7.322; ὅτε, *Od.*7.323. Cf. Danek (1998) 140-41. Contrast Hainsworth (1988) 339-40.

<sup>34</sup> For allusions to alternative versions of Odysseus’ *nostos* elsewhere: Merkelbach (1969) 199-236; West (1981); Reece (1994); Danek (1998) 1-7 and *passim.*; Malkin (1998) 120-55; Marks (2003), (2008) 62-82; Currie (2006) 15-23, (2016) 47-55; Tsagalis (2011) 220-21, (2012); Haller (2013). The narrator’s request in the Odyssean proem for the Muses to ‘speak **to me too**’ (εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν, *Od.*1.10) seems to presuppose predecessors to whom the Muse has previously told the same story: Allen (1924) 139n.1; Danek (1998) 36-37; Scodel (2002) 67-68.

On an intratextual level, meanwhile, we can cite Ares' rebuke of Athena in the Iliadic theomachy as an example of indexed iteration. We have already seen the god recall his former suffering at the hands of Diomedes (*Il.*21.394-99, §III.2.2: 141-43), but we could also note the particle **αὐτ'** which opens his complaint (*Il.*21.394): Athena is '**again**' driving the gods to fight against each other – a remark that even more self-consciously signals the replay of events from *Iliad* 5. In *Odyssey* 16, meanwhile, Athena makes Odysseus an old man '**again**' by striking him with her wand (*Od.*16.456) – the indexical **πάλιν** directs us back to Homer's previous and more extended description of the same transformation at *Od.*13.429-38. The temporal index marks the replay of a past action.

The most striking case of allusive iteration in Homeric epic, however, extends beyond repeated action to repeated language. Near the start of *Iliad* 12, the Trojans are afraid of Hector, who is said to 'fight like a whirlwind **as before**' (αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ὥς τὸ πρόσθεν ἐμάρνατο ἴσος ἀέλλη, *Il.*12.40). As the Homeric scholia note, this phrase looks back to the poet's similar description of Hector in the previous book (*Il.*11.294-98):<sup>35</sup>

ὥς ἐπ' Ἀχαιοῖσιν σεῦε Τρῶας μεγαθύμους  
Ἐκτωρ Πριαμίδης βροτολοιγῶ ἴσος Ἄρηι.  
αὐτὸς δ' ἐν πρώτοισι μέγα φρονέων ἐβεβήκει,  
ἐν δ' ἔπεσ' ὑσμίνῃ ὑπεραεῖ ἴσος ἀέλλη,  
ἧ τε καταλλομένη ἰοειδέα πόντον ὀρίνει.

Notably, these are the only two instances of ἴσος ἀέλλη in all extent early Greek hexameter poetry (both in the same *sedes*), a fact which suggests a strong connection between the two passages.<sup>36</sup> Of course, the phrase may simply be an under-attested formula: elsewhere in Homer, ἴσος is paired with other nouns (including θύελλα and λαῖλαψ) to produce similar short similes, and the Trojans are once compared to 'a blast of dire winds' in comparable language (ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων ἀτάλαντοι ἀέλλη, *Il.*13.795-801).<sup>37</sup> But even if the phrase is

<sup>35</sup> Σ *Il.*12.40b: **μέμνηται** τῶν ἐπὶ ἐκείνων "ἐν δ' ἔπεσ' ὑσμίνῃ, ὑπεραεῖ ἴσος ἀέλλη".

<sup>36</sup> The phrase only reappears in imperial epic: Quint.Smyrn.1.685, Nonn.*Dion.*30.126, Orph.*Argon.*840.

<sup>37</sup> E.g. δαίμονι (*Il.*5.438, 5.459, etc.); Ἄρηι (*Il.*11.295; *Od.*8.115, etc.); λαίλαπι (*Il.*11.747, 12.375, 20.51), φλογὶ...ἠὲ θυέλλῃ (*Il.*13.39); ἔρνεϊ (*Il.*18.56, 18.437; *Od.*14.175).



formulaic, its unique repetition within a short space of time here is significant, marking the continuity in Hector's actions – not only is he still fighting the Achaeans as he was before, but he is doing so in precisely the same manner (cf. too the further storm simile at *Il.*11.305-8). The abbreviated length of the *Iliad* 12 simile (a single half-verse) may even hint at this repetition: it presupposes the fuller, prior version from the previous book. Homer thus practically quotes himself, and by accompanying the verbal repetition with the indexical *ὥς τὸ πρόσθεν*, he acknowledges this iterative act. On a larger scale, this repetition also marks the narrative's return to action and battle after the lengthy interlude in Nestor's tent in the later part of book 11. In an elaborate ring composition, the narrator picks up where he left off.<sup>38</sup> Here, therefore, we have a temporal reference signposting an intratextual quotation within the *Iliad*, a phenomenon which closely resembles the literate poetics of a later age.

### IV.2.3 Epic Epigonality

Already in Early Greek Epic, therefore, time was an important index of allusion: temporal references signalled interactions with other stories and episodes, as well as continuities with the larger tradition. However, as with the other indexes we have explored, this phenomenon is not restricted to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but can be found throughout archaic Greek epic. We have already noted a case in the *Aspis* (ἦδη...καὶ ἄλλοτε, *Scut.*359, §IV.2.1: 197-98), and we can add further examples from Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns*. These poems frequently index passing references to myths with temporal adverbs: in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, Apollo 'once' killed Hyacinthus with a discus (ποτ', fr.171.7), evoking the tale of the god's tragic killing of his beloved,<sup>39</sup> and Eetion, also known as Iasion, 'once' suffered for sleeping with Demeter (ποτέ, fr.177.9).<sup>40</sup> In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the myth of Typhon is introduced with a pair

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Kozak (2017) 107.

<sup>39</sup> *Eur.Hel.*1471-75 (Allan (2008b) 323); *Nic.Ther.*902-6; *Apollod.Bibl.*1.3.3, 3.10.3; Hirschberger (2004) 343-44.

<sup>40</sup> *Od.*5.125-28; *Hes.Theog.*969-71; *Apollod.Bibl.*3.12.1; Hirschberger (2004) 346.

of **ποτέ** adverbs (*HhAp*.305, 307), marking the traditionality of the myth,<sup>41</sup> while in the *Hymn to Hermes*, the newborn god sings of his parents' union as something of the past (**πάρως**, *HhHerm*.58), an index which points not only to the traditional nature of the account, but also to the fact that the union had been narrated in the poet's own voice at the very start of the poem (*HhHerm*.1-12); within the context of the hymn, this is indeed 'old news'.<sup>42</sup> In Hesiod's *Works and Days*, meanwhile, the poet makes a passing reference to the gathering of the Greeks at Aulis before the Trojan war, indexed with a temporal **ποτέ** (*Op*.650-3):

οὐ γάρ πώ ποτε νηὶ [γ'] ἐπέπλων εὐρέα πόντον,  
εἰ μὴ ἐς Εὐβοίαν ἐξ Αὐλίδος, ἣ **ποτ'** Ἀχαιοὶ  
μείναντες χειμῶνα πολὺν σὺν λαὸν ἄγειραν  
Ἑλλάδος ἐξ ἱερῆς Τροίην ἐς καλλιγύναικα.

As scholars have long noted, this reference inaugurates an agonistic moment of Hesiodic self-fashioning, as the poet positions himself against martial epic. Hesiod evokes a core element of the Trojan war *fabula*, the gathering at Aulis, as a foil for his own endeavours: his short, brief and immediately successful voyage contrasts with the long, arduous ἄεθλα of the Greeks (cf. ἄεθλα, *Op*.654).<sup>43</sup> In particular, scholars have noted the 'correction' of traditional epic language in verse 653: Troy is traditionally 'holy' and Greece 'fair-womaned', but Hesiod inverts these terms.<sup>44</sup> By stealing Helen, Troy hardly deserves to be called 'holy', but it is now very much a 'land of beautiful women'.<sup>45</sup> Through the temporal adverb **ποτέ**, Hesiod thus evokes a past and familiar tradition against which he positions his own poetry. In this case, the temporal index marks a more competitive evocation of another myth and poetic tradition.

<sup>41</sup> *Il*.2.780-85; *Hes.Theog*.820-80; *§II*.2.3: 76-82.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Vergados (2013) 271.

<sup>43</sup> Steiner (2005) 350, (2007) 182-86; cf. Nagy (1982) 66; Graziosi (2002) 169-71.

<sup>44</sup> Edwards (1971) 80-81. Fair-womaned Greece (*Il*.2.683, 9.447); Achaea (*Il*.3.75, 258); Sparta (*Od*.13.412, *Hes.fr*.26.3). Holy Troy (*Il*.16.100, *Od*.1.2), Ilion (*Il*.4.46, 164, 416 etc.).

<sup>45</sup> Arrighetti (1998) 441; Graziosi (2002) 170; Debiasi (2008) 32-33; Scodel (2012) 502-3.

The indexical potential of time, therefore, extended throughout archaic Greek epic. It was largely employed to evoke other episodes in an encyclopaedic manner, gesturing to the larger map of tradition, but it could also play a more supplementary role (nodding to other parts of Trojan myth mentioned in passing) or bear an agonistic edge (as with Hesiod and Aulis). So far, however, we have noted plentiful examples of the first two categories of temporal indexicality, but no real example of the third, epigonal self-consciousness. In extant archaic epic, we find no direct invocations of poetic predecessors, a stark foil to later epicists' direct naming of their forebears (Statius and the 'divine Aeneid', *divinam Aeneida*, *Theb.*12.816-17; Nonnus and 'father Homer', πατρός Ὀμήρου, *Dion.*25.265). This absence may largely reflect the predominantly anonymous persona of archaic epicists (especially Homer), as well as the prominence of the epic Muse: as we have noted before, the 'fiction' of the Muses conceals the reality of bardic education and transmission.<sup>46</sup> The poets' self-presentation did not permit a direct invocation of their πρότεροι.

Yet even so, there remains an underlying tension in the temporal framework of both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* which may enact the poet's relationship with his predecessors on a more implicit level. As we have seen, the Iliadic Nestor repeatedly contrasts the grandeur of the past with the more mundane present, and he is far from alone in doing so.<sup>47</sup> Tlepolemus claims that his rival Sarpedon is far inferior to those warriors who were sprung from Zeus 'in the days of men **of old**' (ἐπὶ προτέρων ἀνθρώπων, *Il.*5.637).<sup>48</sup> Odysseus claims that he would not attempt to rival 'men **of the past**', like Heracles or Eurytus of Oechalia (ἀνδράσι...προτέροισιν, *Od.*8.223), the kind of men whom he encounters in the Underworld (προτέρους...ἀνέρας, *Od.*11.630). And Diomedes is criticised by Agamemnon for not living up to the standards of his father (*Il.*4.365-400).<sup>49</sup> Homer's heroes constantly live in the shadow of their predecessors.

<sup>46</sup> §II.2: 60; Ford (1992) 61-63, 90-130.

<sup>47</sup> For generational change in Homer generally: Mackie (2008).

<sup>48</sup> Kelly (2010).

<sup>49</sup> Andersen (1978) esp.33-45; Alden (2000) 112-52; Pratt (2009); Barker – Christensen (2011); Davies (2014) 33-38; Sammons (2014). Cf. Stamatopoulou (2017) on the generational contrast between Diomedes' and Heracles' theomachies.

Given the degree of self-consciousness that we have encountered elsewhere in Homer, it would be attractive to interpret these epigonal moments as a model for Homer's own relationship to his epic forebears and the pre-existing tradition. After all, this nagging contrast between past and present explicitly extends to the narrator's own day when he acknowledges the greater strength of his heroes: not even two men of the present could match the strength of a Diomedes or a Hector in lifting rocks (*Il.*5.302-4, 12.445-49, 20.285-87; cf. 12.381-83). It is not only Homer's characters that feel the burden of living up to the past, but also the contemporary world of the poet himself. Given this complementarity, we may be justified to see the heroes' anxious expressions of epigonality as indexing the poet's own tense relationship with tradition. Scodel has recently suggested such a metapoetic reading, arguing that the modesty of Homer's heroes reflects the poet's own deference to tradition: 'as his characters stand in awe of the mighty men of the past...so the poet views other styles of epic with respect'.<sup>50</sup> It is certainly true that the Homeric poems present themselves as direct heirs to a deep tradition of great achievement. But I am less prepared to see this as a simple expression of meek submission. Rather, I contend that these assertions of epigonality exhibit an eristic drive comparable to that we have encountered elsewhere: despite the overbearing burden of the past, neither Homer nor his characters are fully resigned to an inferior status.

Such agonistic epigonality is clearest when a Homeric son explicitly surpasses his father, resisting the rhetoric of perpetual decline. As we have just noted, Agamemnon accuses Diomedes of failing to live up to his father's standards in *Iliad* 4. His companion Sthenelus, however, revises this claim (*Il.*4.403-10):

τὸν δ' υἱὸς Καπανῆος ἀμείψατο κυδαλίμοιο·  
 Ἀτρεΐδῃ μὴ ψεύδε' ἐπιστάμενος σάφα εἶπεϊν·  
 ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι·  
 ἡμεῖς καὶ Θήβης ἔδος εἵλομεν ἑπταπύλοιο  
 παυρότερον λαὸν ἀγαγόνθ' ὑπὸ τείχος ἄρειον,  
 πειθόμενοι τεράεσσι θεῶν καὶ Ζηνὸς ἀρωγῇ·  
 κείνοι δὲ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο·  
 τῷ μὴ μοι πατέρας ποθ' ὁμοίῃ ἔνθεο τιμῇ.

---

<sup>50</sup> Scodel (2004) 19.

Contrary to Agamemnon's allegations, Sthenelus asserts that Diomedes is superior to his father, who is no paradigm worth emulating. Sthenelus and Diomedes succeeded where their parents had failed, sacking Thebes even when the odds were against them. They were the ones who successfully trusted the gods' portents (πειθόμενοι τεράεσσι θεῶν, 4.408), not Tydeus, as Agamemnon had claimed (θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας, 4.398). And they also profited from Zeus' help (Ζηνὸς ἄρωγῇ, 4.408), an extra detail which combatively caps Agamemnon's account: they even had the king of the gods on their side.<sup>51</sup> Tydeus, by contrast, perished alongside the rest of the Seven through their own folly (σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο, 4.409), an expression which recurs only once elsewhere in Greek poetry to describe the recklessness of Odysseus' companions in the *Odyssey* (*Od.*1.7); like them, the Seven's intransigence and impiety caused their own downfall.<sup>52</sup> Within an explicitly generational frame (ἡμεῖς...πατέρων 4.405; μοι πατέρας, 4.410), Sthenelus' speech thus establishes a clear contrast between father and son in pointedly agonistic terms: the younger warrior, now at Troy, surpasses his father who fought at Thebes.

For the *Iliad*'s relationship with Theban myth, this intergenerational opposition can be interpreted in at least two ways. Slatkin has read the presence of the Theban Epigonoι in Troy as an implicit threat to the Iliadic narrative: given their former success with a small force against a stronger defence (*Il.*4.407), these Theban warriors risk outdoing Agamemnon's own warriors, who also outnumber the Trojan contingent (*Il.*2.119-30, 13.737-39, 15.405-7).<sup>53</sup> Yet as she herself admits, Diomedes' rebuke of Sthenelus here and his later words of support for the expedition (*Il.*9.32-49) place him 'and his companion firmly within the Achaean cohort', seamlessly incorporating these former Theban warriors into Agamemnon's and Homer's panHellenic project.<sup>54</sup> Far from being a threat to the Achaean mission, they are an integral part of it.

---

<sup>51</sup> Barker – Christensen (2011) 26.

<sup>52</sup> Barker – Christensen (2011) 25-26; O'Maley (2014).

<sup>53</sup> Slatkin (2011a) 112; cf. Nagy (1979) 162-63n.3.

<sup>54</sup> Slatkin (2011a) 113.

In this regard, their superiority to their fathers can instead be interpreted as standing for Homer's own supremacy over Theban tradition, despite his junior – even 'epigonal' – status. Barker and Christensen have effectively demonstrated how this whole Iliadic passage sets Tydeus' solitary Achillean heroism against the larger Iliadic ethos of collaboration and collective achievement.<sup>55</sup> Yet this passage also implies a more direct disparity between the fortunes of the Seven and the Greeks at Troy: Zeus' signs of ill-will when Tydeus visited Mycenae (παράϊσια σήματα, *Il.*4.381) directly contrast with the positive signals he offered at the start of the Trojan expedition (ἐναΐσιμα σήματα, *Il.*2.353).<sup>56</sup> If Pindar's specification that Zeus failed to hurl propitious lightning for the Seven (οὐδὲ Κρονίων ἀστεροπὰν ἐλελίξαις, *Nem.*9.19) draws on earlier Theban traditions, as Braswell has suggested,<sup>57</sup> the contrast could be even more precise: it was precisely Zeus' auspicious lightning that marked the departure of the Greeks to Troy (ἀστράπτων ἐπιδέξι', *Il.*2.353). Agamemnon's troops, like the Epigonoi, are set to succeed where the Seven failed. Homer's evocation of Theban myth thus has a distinctively agonistic edge, defining the *Iliad* against the failed heroism of a rival tradition's older generation. Other archaic poets often presented Trojan and Theban war traditions on a par with each other;<sup>58</sup> yet Homer was clearly not content with such parity and instead implies his own poetic supremacy, offering perhaps the earliest Greek instance of generational succession as an intertextual trope.<sup>59</sup> What makes this poetic polemic so striking, however, is how it reverses the usual epic pattern of generational decline and the unreachability of the past. In contrast to Hesiod's 'Myth of Races' and the repeated Homeric refrain of the greater strength of past heroes (*Il.*5.304, 12.383, 20.287), in this case the younger and newer generation proves superior: Diomedes surpasses Tydeus and Homer outshines Theban myth.

<sup>55</sup> Barker – Christensen (2011). On the centrality of the collective to the *Iliad*: Elmer (2013).

<sup>56</sup> Ebbott (2014) 334.

<sup>57</sup> Braswell (1998) 81-82, who suspects Pindar's debt to the *Thebaid* and compares the absence of thunder in Statius' scene of auspice-taking (*Theb.*3.460-551). Pindar alludes to the *Thebaid* elsewhere: *Ol.*6.17 (~ *Theb.*fr.6). For his use of cyclic material more generally: Rutherford (2015); Currie (2016) 247-53; Spelman (2018b).

<sup>58</sup> Hes.*Op.*161-65; Pind.*Pyth.*3.86-103; Anac.fr.261; Barker – Christensen (2011) 35-36.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Chaudhuri (2014) 29-36. For this trope in Roman poetry: Hardie (1993) 88-119.

The Homeric language of time, therefore, conveys a strong implicit sense of epigonality. The poet does not directly compare himself with his πρότεροι, but he does so implicitly through the anxieties voiced by his characters. A similarly agonistic stance can also be found in other cases where characters position themselves against former generations. In the *Odyssey*, although Odysseus claims that he would not compete with men of the past like Heracles (ἀνδράσι...πρωτέροισιν, *Od.*8.223), his katabatic encounter with that very hero can be read in pointedly eristic terms: the hero stresses that he went to Hades ‘under his own steam’ without a guide (*Od.*10.501-5), in comparison to Heracles, who relied on help from Hermes and Athena (11.626).<sup>60</sup> Moreover, in killing the suitors with the bow of Eurytus (another predecessor: *Od.*8.224), he accomplishes ‘a feat suggesting a likeness between himself and these heroes after all’.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, Amphimedon’s ghost pictures Odysseus in a staunchly Heraclean mode as he commences the slaughter, glancing about terribly, just like Heracles in the Underworld – a unique and meaningful repetition (δεινὸν παπταίνων, *Od.*24.179 = 11.608).<sup>62</sup> In spite of Odysseus’ protestations of inferiority, therefore, his actions in fact prove a match to those of the previous generation. In more general terms, too, the greater piety of the Homeric heroes can be read as a mark of their superiority over the brutality and theomachic pretensions of earlier generations.<sup>63</sup> Homeric heroes’ tense relations with their predecessors, therefore, mark Homer’s own relationship with tradition.

And nor is this just a Homeric phenomenon: the opening of the Cyclic *Epigoni* similarly highlights its epigonal status. The narrator invites the Muse to begin ‘**now, in turn**’ on the ‘**younger men**’ (νῦν αὖθ’ ὀπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχώμεθα, Μοῦσαι, fr.1). Here,

<sup>60</sup> Alden (2017) 174. Note θέσκελα ἔργα (*Od.*11.317 = 11.610), aligning Heracles’ belt and Odysseus’ deeds. For the *Odyssey*’s engagement with Heraclean myth: Clay (1997) 89-96; Crissy (1997); Thalmann (1998) 176-80; Danek (1998) 245-50; de Jong (2001) 507; Schein (2001), (2002); Karanika (2011); Andersen (2012).

<sup>61</sup> Crissy (1997) 50.

<sup>62</sup> Karanika (2011) 11-12 (cf. πάπτηνεν δ’Ὀδυσσεύς, *Od.*22.381). On the verb’s associations: Lonsdale (1989).

<sup>63</sup> Scodel (2004) 18-19. Cf. Goode (2012) on a potential allusion to Tydeus’ barbaric consumption of Melanippus’ brains (*Theb.*fr.9) in Tydeus’ headstrong disregard of Athena’s advice (*Il.*5.802-8: note θυμὸν ἔχων ὃν καρτερόν, *Il.*5.806 ~ ἀπὸ θυμοῦ, *Theb.*fr.9): cf. Torres-Guerra (1995) 43.

temporal adverbs combine with Nestorian language of youth to highlight the *Epigonoí*'s self-conscious secondariness as a sequel to the *Thebaid*.<sup>64</sup> As in *Iliad* 4, the generational succession embedded in Theban myth appears to have made it a ripe source for figuring the poet's relationship with his traditional heritage. As we shall see in the next chapter, such positioning against predecessors was to become an even more important – and explicit – part of later lyric poets' literary posturing.

Already in Early Greek Hexameter Poetry, therefore, we find traces of all three categories of temporal indexicality with which we began. Time proved an active trope to figure a poet's relationship with other texts and traditions, with both an encyclopaedic and agonistic edge. Temporal indexes signpost passing references to other traditions, as well as more pointed replays of tradition, while epic heroes' epigonal relationships with their *πρότεροι* figure the tensions of the poet's own relationship with his predecessors. Together, these various temporal indexes map out the larger tradition against which epic poets situate their own, epigonal work.

---

<sup>64</sup> Currie (2016) 26n.163. Cf. Cingano (2015) 254-55, comparing the use of *vūv* to join the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* to the *Theogony*.



### IV.3 Lyric Temporalities

The indexical potential of time becomes even more potent in archaic Greek lyric, a corpus of poetry that is intimately concerned with occasion, performance and the interconnections of past and present.<sup>65</sup> Although lyric focuses largely on contemporary events and situations, lyricists often evoke moments of myth or history as parallels for the present. We have seen that cases of poetic memory were surprisingly rare in lyric poetry, but time – by contrast – is a recurrent concern. As in epic, references to earlier events of the literary tradition are frequently framed in overtly temporal terms, marking lyricists' epigonal relationship with their literary heritage (§IV.3.1). Yet even more explicitly, the frequently personal voices of lyric prompted numerous direct references to earlier poetic predecessors (§IV.3.2), alongside a far greater awareness of the repetitive nature of poetic composition (§IV.3.3).

#### IV.3.1 Once Upon a Time

Let us start with lyricists' more general appeals to poetic antiquity – occasions on which they knowingly nod to the literary past. As in Homer, earlier episodes from the literary tradition are often signposted as ancient and venerable traditions, framing the audience's and poet's relationship with them in temporal terms. Archilochus' Telephus elegy, for example, introduces the mythical exemplum of the Achaeans' retreat on Mysia with **καί ποτε** (fr.17a.4), marking the familiarity of the myth, as known from the *Cypria* and elsewhere (cf. §II.3.1: 90n.81), while Alcman introduces the myth of Odysseus and Circe with a Doric inflection of the same phrase, pointing to well-known Odyssean traditions (fr.80): **καί ποκ'**

---

<sup>65</sup> On temporality in lyric poetry, tied to issues of performance and occasion: Mackie (2003); D'Alessio (2004); Budelmann (2017).

Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος ὥατ' ἐταίρων | Κίρκᾳ ἐπαλείψασα.<sup>66</sup> In a more personal, intratextual move, meanwhile, Sappho claims that **'once long ago**, I loved you, Atthis' (ἡράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Ἄτθι, **πάλαι ποτά**, fr.49.1), a phrase which – like the reminiscences of Atthis in fr.96 (cf. §III.3.1: 164-65) – may well evoke earlier poems about Sappho's relationship with this girl, which ended with Atthis flying off to another woman, Andromeda (fr.131). A particularly loaded use of a temporal adverb, however, occurs in the hymnic proem of Theognis' first book. After two invocations of Apollo and one of Artemis, the poet calls on the Muses and Graces, recalling their former presence at the wedding of Cadmus and Harmonia (Thgn.1.15-18):<sup>67</sup>

Μοῦσαι καὶ Χάριτες, κοῦραι Διός, αἳ **ποτε** Κάδμου  
 ἐς γάμον ἐλθοῦσαι καλὸν αἰεῖσατ' **ἔπος**,  
 “ὅττι καλόν, φίλον ἐστί· τὸ δ' οὐ καλὸν οὐ φίλον ἐστί,”  
 τοῦτ' **ἔπος** ἀθανάτων ἦλθε διὰ στομάτων.

This wedding was a well-established mythical episode: it features already in Hesiod's *Theogony* (*Theog.*937, 975) and Pindar's third *Pythian* ode, singing Muses and all (*Pyth.*3.88-99, esp. 90 μελπομενᾶν...Μοισᾶν).<sup>68</sup> Given its prominent proemial position, immediately before the poet's *sphragis*, the recollection here appears to have a particularly programmatic function: the Muses' and Graces' quoted verse exploits the polysemous range of *καλός* to praise not just moral goodness and nobility, a key concern of the *Theognidea*, but also aesthetic and poetic

<sup>66</sup> Alcman may allude to an alternative version than that in our *Odyssey*, or creatively combine elements from the tradition known to us, blurring Circe's advice to Odysseus (ἐπὶ δ' οὐατ' ἀλείψαι ἐταίρων, *Od.*12.47) with her actual anointing of his companions to restore their human form (προσάλειφεν, *Od.*10.392): cf. Davison (1955) 139-40; Hinge (2006) 257; Kelly (2015a) 32-33.

<sup>67</sup> For these four prefatory invocations, scholars compare the four which precede a collection of Attic *skolia* preserved by Athenaeus 15.694c-695f (884-87 *PMG*). Despite the clearly composite nature of the *Theognidea*, I am prepared to read what we have as a unity with some design. For a summary of views on the corpus' origin: Gerber (1997) 117-20; Selle (2008) esp. 372-93; Gagné (2013) 249-51.

<sup>68</sup> On the wedding: Gantz (1996) 471-72, adding Nonn.*Dion.* 5.88-189, the fullest extant treatment of the episode (with the Muses' song at 103).

beauty.<sup>69</sup> What matters more specifically for us here, however, is the manner in which this famous mythical episode is signposted as a past event (ποτέ). In addition to this temporal indexing, the Muses' song is also flagged as pointedly epic: the goddesses' *gnome* is explicitly called an ἔπος in the lines that precede and follow it (Thgn.1.16, 18), perhaps prompting an audience to recall pre-existing *epic* traditions of the Theban marriage.<sup>70</sup> The content of the quoted verse also reinforces this impression. Although the phrase was apparently proverbial by the fifth century,<sup>71</sup> it appears to have retained a specific association with Cadmus: in Euripides' *Phoenissae*, the chorus offer a variation of the phrase shortly before mentioning the same Theban marriage,<sup>72</sup> while the sentiment reappears as a refrain in the third stasimon of the *Bacchae*, at the very moment that Pentheus, Cadmus' grandson, unwittingly heads to his death. With grim irony, the dynasty's origins are recalled at the demise of its last representative (ὅτι καλὸν φίλον αἰεὶ, *Bacch.* 881, 901). Given the phrase's recurring association with Cadmus' race, it is thus tempting to see Theognis self-consciously citing a famous verse associated with the marriage. Dodds suspects Hesiod as the ultimate source,<sup>73</sup> but given our absence of further evidence, it makes more sense to speak of Theban epic tradition in general, a tradition which – as we have already seen – was a rich source of allusive material from Homer onwards (§IV.2.3: 204-6). Once more, we thus have an allusive evocation of other traditions signalled in temporal terms, here with the additional prompt of a generic cue.

<sup>69</sup> Giannini (1993) 388. The goddesses' statement on τὸ καλόν is self-referentially described as καλόν: Kayachev (2016) 196. The 'harmonious' frame evokes Cadmus' wife Harmonia: Nagy (1979) 299 §12n.6.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Nagy (2010) 20, comparing Tyrtaeus fr.4.2, where ἔπεια similarly flags citation of a hexameter oracle. On the meaning of ἔπος: Koller (1972), Nagy (1979) 272; Martin (2005) 13-14. The plural ἔπεια could also refer to elegy (ἔπεσιν, ἔπη, ἐπέων, Thgn.20, 22, 755; κόσμον ἐπέων, Solon fr.1.2), but the singular has a particular association with hexameter epic. On the *Theognidea's* relationship with epic: Edmunds (1985).

<sup>71</sup> Plato cites it as such: ἀρχαία παροιμία (*Lys.* 216c).

<sup>72</sup> οὐ γὰρ ὁ μὴ καλὸν οὐποτ' ἔφν κάλον (*Phoen.* 814)...Ἀρμονίας δέ ποτ' εἰς ὑμεναίους | ἦλυθον οὐρανίδαί (*Phoen.* 822-3). Valckenaer's emendation (ἔφν φίλον) reinforces the connection but is unnecessary.

<sup>73</sup> Dodds (1960) 187.

Such temporal indexing of other myths and traditions, however, is especially prominent in the odes of Pindar, from whom we only have space to cite several examples.<sup>74</sup> In *Nemean* 3, the poet sets out to celebrate Aegina, the land ‘where the Myrmidons **of old** dwelled’ with their ‘**long-famed** assembly place’ (Μυρμιδόνες ἵνα **πρότεροι** ἔκησαν, ὧν **παλαίφατον** ἀγορὰν κτλ., *Nem.*3.13-14). The double emphasis on antiquity reinforces a reference to the myth which originally situated Aeacus in Aegina, as the offspring of the nymph Aegina and Zeus, before he relocated to Thessalian Phthia.<sup>75</sup> In *Pythian* 6, meanwhile, Pindar introduces Antilochus’ self-sacrifice to save his father Nestor as a model for Thrasybulus’ similar behaviour in the present (*Pyth.*6.28-45), recalling an episode already apparently told in the *Aethiopis* (*Aeth.*arg.2c).<sup>76</sup> Here too, the myth is presented in a temporal frame: the opening **καὶ πρότερον** (*Pyth.*6.28) firmly situates the episode in the past, as does the closural τὰ μὲν **παρίκει** (*Pyth.*6.43). Together, these comments signal the literary antiquity of this episode, while also marking it off from Pindar’s poetic present: like modern-day speech marks, they frame the mythical citation. This temporal distance is further reinforced by the final mention of the praise bestowed on Antilochus by the young men in the generation of those ‘**long ago**’ (τῶν **πάλαι** γενεᾷ ὀπλοτέροισιν, *Pyth.*6.40-41) – Antilochus’ achievements belong to the distant past of literary myth. In this specific context, the emphasis on Antilochus’ antiquity also forms an effective contrast with Thrasybulus, who attains the same standard most closely of men alive in Pindar’s day (τῶν **νῦν**, *Pyth.*6.44). The distance in time between the two youths aptly parallels the temporal sweep between Pindar and his literary predecessors.

---

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Mackie (2003) 43.

<sup>75</sup> The double temporal reference may also index allusions to the *Iliad* (Xian (2018)) and to the tradition that the Myrmidons were transformed from ants (μύρμηκες: Hes.fr.205; Carnes (1990)).

<sup>76</sup> Cf. §III.2.1: 134-35; Welcker (1865–82) II.174; Burgess (2009) 31-34; West (2013) 145-46. Proclus’ summary does not specify the manner of Antilochus’ death (for which we have to turn to later sources: Philostr.*Her.*26.18, Quint.Smyrn.7.49-50, cf. 2.243-5), but the myth already seems to be allusively redeployed in the *Iliad* (*Il.*8.78-98: Burgess (2009) 74; Currie (2016) 247-53). The antiquity of the myth is further suggested by its presence on the East Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi: Shapiro (1988); Athanassaki (2012).

As a final Pindaric example, however, we should cite a case in which temporal references appear to conceal slight innovations in the mythical record. We have previously noted the importation of the local into panhellenic myth, authorised by Pindar's appeal to the 'ancient talk of men' in *Olympian* 7 (ἀνθρώπων παλαιαὶ ῥήσιες, *Ol.*7.54-5: §II.3.4: 117-18), but we could also add the miniature narrative of Peleus' and Telamon's achievements in *Nemean* 3, which is introduced with the description of Peleus taking delight in παλαιαὶ ἀρεταί, 'achievements of long ago' (*Nem.*3.32-39):

παλαιαῖσι δ' ἐν ἀρεταῖς  
 γέγαθε Πηλεὺς ἄναξ ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών·  
 ὃς καὶ Ἰωλκὸν εἴλε μόνος ἄνευ στρατιᾶς,  
 καὶ ποντίαν Θέτιν κατέμαρψεν  
 ἐγκονητί. Λαομέδοντα δ' εὐρυσθενῆς  
 Τελαμῶν Ἰόλα παραστάτας ἐὼν ἔπερσεν·  
 καὶ ποτε χαλκότοξον Ἀμαζόνων μετ' ἄλκᾱν  
 ἔπετό οἱ· οὐδέ νῖν ποτε φόβος ἀνδροδάμας ἔπαυσεν ἀκμὰν φρενῶν.

The verses summarise a number of major moments in each hero's life: Peleus' acquisition of his famous spear from Mt. Pelion, his capture of the city of Iolcus and his marriage to Thetis, alongside Telamon's involvement in the first sack of Troy and his battle with the Amazons. These are all well known features of each hero's mythological biography, here serving as appropriate models of success for Pindar's *laudandus* Aristocleidas.<sup>77</sup> In particular, Peleus' conquest of Thetis is figured in distinctly athletic terms (κατέμαρψεν, ἐγκονητί), presaging Aristocleidas' own pancratium success in the present.<sup>78</sup> But in the case of Peleus' other two

<sup>77</sup> For Peleus' sack of Iolcus: Hes.fr. 211, fr.212(b); Pind.*Nem.*4.54-65. For his marriage to Thetis: *Nem.*5.34-37, *Isth.*8.26-47. For Telamon's accompaniment of Heracles against Laomedon's Troy: §II.3.1: 94n.95; and against the Amazons: fr.*adesp.*9 EGF (= 1168 SH: Vecchiato (2016)), and various vases (von Bothmer (1957) 234: Index of Inscribed Names, s.v. 'Telamon'). Both these Telamonian exploits are occasionally associated with Peleus (Pind.*Isth.*5.36-37, fr.172; Eur.*Andr.*796).

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Σ *Nem.*3.61a: ἡ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀθλευόντων; Pfeijffer (1999) 207, 317-18. Thetis' resistance: *Il.*18.434, *Cypr.*fr.3.

successes, his acquisition of his spear and sack of Iolcus, Pindar's appeal to 'ancient achievements' appears to conceal pointed deviations from the mainstream tradition.<sup>79</sup> In the case of his spear, the hero is depicted as having cut it himself (ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών, *Nem.*3.33), unlike earlier epic accounts in which the spear is a wedding gift from Cheiron (*Il.*16.140-44 ≈ 19.387-91, *Cypr.*fr.4), and even shaped by the divine hands of Athena and Hephaestus (*Cypr.*fr.4); while in his sack of Iolcus, he is depicted as a lone fighter (μόνος ἄνευ στρατιᾶς, *Nem.*3.34), unlike other versions in which he is helped by Jason and the Dioscuri.<sup>80</sup> As the scholia to the passage note, Pindar seems to be 'indulging Peleus for the sake of his Aeginetan victor', exaggerating his achievements for rhetorical effect (δόξει δὲ ὁ Πίνδαρος διὰ τὸν Αἰγινήτην χαρίζεσθαι τῷ Πηλεΐ, Σ *Nem.*3.57). In fashioning his own supreme spear and in single-handedly sacking Iolcus, this Peleus is a pre-eminent paradigm of Aeginetan success. By introducing these adaptations as *παλαιαὶ ἀρεταί*, Pindar thus lends legitimacy to his innovative spin on tradition.

As in epic, therefore, temporal references in lyric – and especially Pindaric poetry – frequently signal interactions with other mythical stories and episodes. Temporally marked adjectives and adverbs highlight allusions both to earlier treatments of myths and to a poet's own earlier poetry. In this way, archaic lyricists drew on the esteem of tradition to legitimise their own poetic authority, while also occasionally concealing their innovative versions of myth in the garb of tradition. The literary past thus remained a fruitful resource to be both appropriated and reconfigured.

### IV.3.2 Poetic Predecessors

---

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Pfeijffer (1999) 206-8.

<sup>80</sup> Pherec.fr.62; Apollod.*Bibl.*3.13.7.

Besides these allusive temporal markers, some lyricists also went further than their epic ancestors in directly acknowledging and citing their literary forebears. Thanks to the less detached voice of lyric, these poets could actively refer to their predecessors with an epigonal self-awareness, both naming them approvingly as a source of authority and citing them antagonistically as in need of correction. In the Introduction, we have already discussed lyricists' direct naming of their forebears (§I.2.3: 42-45). Here, however, I shall focus on vague appeals to anonymous predecessors, a loaded gesture of epigonality which often conceals citations of poetic traditions or even specific texts. Temporal relations in lyric poetry were not just elaborated in the world of myth itself, but also explicitly between these poets and earlier generations of bards.

In some cases, poetic **πρότεροι** are cited as a source of authority, whose example a poet readily follows. Again, this phenomenon is especially prevalent in Pindar. In *Nemean* 6, the Theban poet closes his description of Achilles' victory over Memnon (*Nem.*6.49-53) with the claim that he follows the 'highway of song' that was found by '**older** poets' (καὶ ταῦτα μὲν **παλαιότεροι** | ὁδὸν ἀμαξιτὸν εὖρον· ἔπομαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχων μελέταν, *Nem.*6.53-54). The poet marks his epigonal relationship to the epic tradition, especially that of the *Aethiopis*, with a firm sense of belatedness.<sup>81</sup> Similarly in *Nemean* 3, the poet intersperses his account of Achilles' life (*Nem.*3.43-63) with the claim that 'The story I have to tell was **told by my predecessors**' (λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο **προτέρων** | ἔπος ἔχω, *Nem.*3.52-53). Here too, this gesture marks the traditionality of the whole account, both the preceding details of Achilles' upbringing (*Nem.*3.43-52) and the following highlights of his military career, which – as in *Nemean* 6 – include his Aethiopic clash with Memnon (*Nem.*3.56-63).<sup>82</sup> Pindar pictures his

<sup>81</sup> Nisetich (1989) 22; Gerber (1999a) 75; Rutherford (2015) 456; Spelman (2018a) 250-51, (2018b) §3. For the metapoetic resonance of following footsteps: Nelson (forthcoming C).

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Bury (1890) 55; West (2011b) 60; Agócs (2011) 207-8. Pfeijffer (1999) 350-51 suspects that the preceding account of Achilles' miraculous youth is Pindaric invention, but see Rawles (2018) 38n.44 on the traces of such a tradition in iconography. Pfeijffer may be right, however, to see Achilles' youth here foreshadowing Achilles' future exploits as known in the *Iliad* (Pfeijffer (1999) 213), fitting the ode's larger interest in the consistency of an individual's virtue across a lifetime (*Nem.*3.70-75).

predecessors as a monolithic block, acknowledging the authoritative weight of the epic tradition.

As with indexical appeals to hearsay, however, generalised plurals can also conceal a nod to specific literary predecessors. In *Pythian* 3, for example, Pindar cites his **πρότεροι** for a statement which scholars both ancient and modern have read as a reference to our *Iliad* (*Pyth.*3.80-82):

εἰ δὲ λόγων συνέμεν κορυφάν, Ἰέρων, ὀρθὰν ἐπίστα, **μανθάνων οἶσθα προτέρων**  
ἐν παρ' ἑσλὸν πῆματα σύνδυο δαίονται βροτοῖς  
ἄθάνατοι.

If Hieron can understand the true point of sayings, Pindar claims, he will know the lesson of their **πρότεροι**, that the immortals apportion to humans a pair of evils for every good. Since antiquity, this gnomic statement has plausibly been interpreted as a reference to Achilles' famous description of the jars of Zeus in *Iliad* 24: *δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὔδει | δῶρων οἷα δίδωσι κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων* (*Il.*24.527-28).<sup>83</sup> But while most other ancient commentators interpreted the passage as referring to two jars, one of evil and one of good (e.g. *Pl.Resp.*379d; *Plut.Mor.*24a), Pindar appears to have creatively misread the text to make two parts of evil for every one part of good, a ratio which chimes with the ode's larger concern with the 'preponderance of pain'.<sup>84</sup> Of course, there are no precise verbal echoes between these specific lines and Pindar does not even mention urns, which might lead us to suspect that he is simply referring to a more general *gnome*. Yet the ensuing paradigmatic presence of Peleus in both texts reinforces the connection: in each poem, the hero enjoys unsurpassed prosperity (*ὄλβον ὑπέρτατον*, *Pyth.*3.89 ~ *πάντας γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἐκέκαστο | ὄλβῳ τε πλούτῳ τε*, *Il.*24.535-36) and marries the divine Thetis (*Pyth.*3.92-96 ~ *Il.*24.537), but suffers because of the misfortune of his only (*μόνον/ἕνα*) child (*Pyth.*3.100-103 ~ *Il.*24.540).<sup>85</sup> In both cases, moreover,

<sup>83</sup> Cannata Fera (1986); Macleod (1982) 133; Robbins (1990) 313-14; Mann (1994) 318-23; Fearn (2007) 73n.142; Morgan (2015) 287-88; Spelman (2018a) 92-93. Differently: Luppino (1959); Currie (2005) 390-92.

<sup>84</sup> Robbins (1990) 313-17; cf. Σ *Pyth.*3.141a.

<sup>85</sup> Robbins (1990) 313; Mann (1994) 319-20.



the moral is the same: one must accept one's lot (*Pyth.*3.103-4 ~ *Il.*24.543-51). Given this series of parallels, it is thus tempting to see verses 81-82 as a pointed *variatio* (and misreading) of the Iliadic sentiment, suited to Pindar's larger consolatory goal, co-opting the authority of his Homeric predecessor. Moreover, besides the appeal to **πρότεροι**, this allusion is further triggered by a string of nearby indexes, including Pindar's emphasis on words (**λόγοι**) and understanding (**ἐπίστα, οἶσθα**), alongside the footnoting **λέγονται** that introduces the account of Peleus (*Pyth.*3.88). This accumulation of indexical markers encourages us to look to the specific Iliadic intertext underlying Pindar's rather vague gesture to his **πρότεροι**. Behind the generalised 'predecessors', we find a precise reference to the greatest of them all, Homer himself.

Such epigonal awareness is even clearer in the opening of *Isthmian* 2, as Pindar sketches out his own literary history by drawing a contrast between the behaviour of former poets ('men of long ago', οἱ μὲν **πάλαι** ... φῶτες) and modern-day hirelings obsessed with a profit. Whereas the former freely shot forth pederastic hymns at beautiful boys, the Muse of Pindar's day has now become a greedy labourer (*Isth.*2.1-11):

Οἱ μὲν **πάλαι**, ὦ Θρασύβουλε, φῶτες, οἱ χρυσαμπύκων  
 ἐς δίφρον Μοσᾶν ἔβαινον κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι,  
 ῥίμφα παιδεῖους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους,  
 ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας  
 εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν.

Ἄ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδὴς πω τότε ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις·  
 οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖαι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας  
 ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί.  
 νῦν δ' ἐφίητι <τὸ> τώργειοι φυλάξαι  
 ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας <u -> ἄγχιστα βαῖνον,

"χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ" ὅς φᾶ κτεάνων θ' ἄμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων.

Here too, a vague reference to earlier men (οἱ **πάλαι** φῶτες) bears a specific poetic resonance, recalling earlier literary traditions, reinforced by the indexical reference to these poets' 'famous lyre' (**κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι**, *Isth.*2.7). The scholia cite Alcaeus, Ibycus and Anacreon as the kinds of

predecessors that Pindar must have in mind,<sup>86</sup> and Pindar's language supports this inference. Already in antiquity, scholars noted specific echoes of both Anacreon and Alcaeus: the former wistfully recalls a time when 'Persuasion did not shine all silver' (οὐδ' ἀργυρῇ κω τότ' ἔλαμπε Πειθῶ, Anac.fr.384), comparable to Pindar's nostalgic reminiscence of a time before the silver-faced songs of his own day (ἀργυρῇ ~ ἀργυρωθεῖσαι, *Isth.*2.8; οὐδ'...κω τότ' ~ οὐ...πω τότ', *Isth.*2.6), while Alcaeus is also recorded as citing the proverb of Aristodemus in Sparta, presumably the same person as Pindar's 'Argive man' (fr.360 ~ *Isth.*2.9-11).<sup>87</sup> But there is more besides these long-acknowledged intertexts: one of the few earlier poetic appearances of the noun ὀπώρα is Alcaeus' τερένας ἄνθος ὀπώρας ('the flower of soft autumn', fr.397 ~ ὀπώραν, *Isth.*2.5), a fragment whose floral imagery suggests a potentially pederastic context.<sup>88</sup> More generally, the erotic flavour of these verses is reinforced by the degrading prostitution of the Muse Terpsichore: as previous scholars have recognised, ἐργάτις (2.6) here suggests 'courtesan' (cf. Archil.fr.208) and ἐπέρναντο (2.7) aurally evokes the role of the πόρνη,<sup>89</sup> while the description of silver-faced songs (2.8) recalls the white-painted faces of Greek prostitutes in addition to the payment of silver coins.<sup>90</sup> Through his vague reference to 'men of long ago', therefore, Pindar conjures up a whole genre of pederastic poetry – and potentially even specific

<sup>86</sup> Σ *Isth.*2.1b. This trio are commonly cited as erotic poets (e.g. Ar.*Thesm.*161-62): Woodbury (1968) 532n.6.

<sup>87</sup> Σ *Isth.*2.13; Σ *Isth.*2.17. On the Alcaean link, cf. Santoni (1983) 97-104; Nafissi (1991) 345n.2; Spelman (2018a) 273n.51. Bergk's conjecture of τῶλκαίου for τῶργείου (*Isth.*2.9: cf. Liberman (1999) 245) is unnecessary, since Pindar is more likely referring to the Argive Aristodemus (as Alcaeus does explicitly: Ἀριστόδαμον). Intriguingly, Alcaeus himself attributes this 'saying' to tradition (φαῖς, fr.360.2, cf. ποτ', fr.360.1). Pindar is engaging in a pre-existing and ongoing tradition of citing and appropriating this adage.

<sup>88</sup> Other pre-Pindaric uses of the noun: *Il.*22.27, *Od.*11.192, 12.76, 14.384, Alc.m.fr.96. For Alcaeus' pederastic poetry: Barner (1967) 25-26; Vetta (1982).

<sup>89</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922) 311 with n.1; Thummer (1968-69) II.40; Rawles (2018) 136n.8.

<sup>90</sup> Bowra (1964) 355-56; Simpson (1969) 471n.65; Nicholson (2000) 241.

poets – as a foil for the epinician poetry of the modern day.<sup>91</sup> His reference to οἱ **πάλαι** φῶτες marks his allusive interaction.

In other cases, however, Pindar and his fellow lyricists cite their predecessors in a more agonistic mode, polemically positioning themselves against what has come before. Commonly cited in this regard is Pindar's *Olympian* 1, in which the poet explicitly speaks out against his forebears by 'correcting' their version of Tantalus' banquet with the gods (υἱὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ' ἀντία **προτέρων** φθέγξομαι, *Ol.*1.36).<sup>92</sup> In the traditional version more familiar to us from later sources, Tantalus was invited to a banquet of the gods and served his own dismembered son to his hosts in a cauldron; the goddess Demeter (or in some versions Thetis) inadvertently consumed the boy's shoulder while distracted with grief for her daughter Persphone; and after the gods realised the trick, Hermes revived Pelops, who was given a new ivory shoulder crafted by Hephaestus to replace that which had been eaten.<sup>93</sup> Pindar's polemic clearly presupposes the pre-existence of this traditional version, as does the Pindaric scholia's attribution to his contemporary Bacchylides of a tale in which Rhea was responsible for restoring Pelops by lowering him into a cauldron (*Bacchyl.*fr.42). Rather than accept this account, however, Pindar proposes an alternative version, in which Poseidon fell in love with Pelops and took him away, just as Zeus later did Ganymedes;<sup>94</sup> Tantalus' punishment was for stealing ambrosia and nectar from the gods, not serving his own son to them (*Ol.*1.54-66); and Pelops' ivory shoulder was simply a defect with which he was born (*Ol.*1.26-27). The mainstream account, he asserts, is a malicious invention of envious neighbours which has managed to infiltrate the literary tradition.<sup>95</sup>

<sup>91</sup> There may thus be some point in the fact that Pindar composed a pederastic poem for Thrasybulus, the addressee of this epinician (fr.124). There is much debate about the precise significance of this opening contrast: Woodbury (1968); Nisetich (1977); Cairns (2011); Kurke (2013) 208-22; Spelman (2018a) 268-76.

<sup>92</sup> Köhnken (1974); Howie (1983).

<sup>93</sup> E.g. *Eur.IT.*386-88; *Hel.*388-89; *Lycoph.Alex.*152-55; *Ov.Met.*6.403-11; *Hyg.Fab.*83.

<sup>94</sup> Pindar acknowledges his 'true' version as a doublet of the myth of Ganymedes (note the temporal index: **δευτέρω χρόνῳ**, *Ol.*1.43): Kakridis (1930b).

<sup>95</sup> West (2011b) 67 compares Pindar to a textual critic, 'giving his story of how a postulated corruption came about'.

Far from cashing in on the prestige of his literary predecessors, therefore, Pindar here antagonistically opposes them. He asserts his own authority by highlighting the inadequacies of those who have come before him. Naturally, there are clear advantages to his sanitised version of the myth: not only is it in keeping with the positive sensibilities of epinician poetry, but it also enhances the paradigmatic value of the Tantalus myth for the present poem. In rewriting tradition, Pindar stresses the civilised decorum of Tantalus' feast: it is εὐνομώτατον ('most orderly', 1.37) and his homeland Sipylus is φίλαν ('friendly', 1.38). The result is a far more effective parallel for the poem's *laudandus*, Hieron, whose own table was earlier described with the same adjective (φίλαν, 1.16).<sup>96</sup> In this case, therefore, Pindar's appeal to his predecessors is not simply a legitimising act or allusive marker, but a means for the poet to situate himself and his version of a myth against the larger tradition.<sup>97</sup>

Such an agonistic mode is also visible in elegiac poetry. In Xenophanes's elegy on the well-ordered symposium, the poet dismisses the battles of Titans, Giants and Centaurs as the 'fabrications of our **predecessors**' (fr.1.19-24):

ἀνδρῶν δ' αἰνεῖν τοῦτον ὃς ἐσθλὰ πίων ἀναφαίνει,  
 ὥς ἢ μνημοσύνη καὶ τόνοσ' ἀμφ' ἀρετῆς·  
 οὐ τι μάχας διέπειν Τιτῆνων οὐδὲ Γιγάντων  
 οὐδέ <τι> Κενταύρων, πλάσμα<τα> τῶν **πρωτέρων**,  
 ἢ στάσιος σφεδανὰς—τοῖς οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἔνεστιν—  
 θεῶν <δὲ> προμηθεῖν αἰὲν ἔχειν ἀγαθήν.

Here too, Xenophanes' **πρότεροι** highlight poetic precedent: Xenophanes' dismissal of the chaotic battles fought by Titans, Giants and Centaurs evokes the warring world of epic, especially those poems in which such primeval conflicts took centre stage: Hesiod's *Theogony* (*Theog.*617-720) and the Cyclic *Titanomachy*. But other epics also invoked such subjects in

<sup>96</sup> For this ode's interplay of moderation in speech and feasting: Steiner (2002).

<sup>97</sup> We should be wary of accepting Pindar's posturing too innocently, however: the language used to describe his predecessors' deceitful embellishments parallels that used of his own poetry elsewhere: *Ol.*1.29 (δεδαίδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις) ~ *Ol.*1.105 (δαίδαλωσέμεν), *Nem.*8.15 (πεποικιλμέναν) and fr.94b.32 (δαίδαλλοισ' ἔπεσιν): Feeney (1991) 18 with n.49.

passing: the Centauromachy features on Heracles' shield in the Hesiodic *Aspis* (*Scut.*178-90) and is also cited by Antinous in the *Odyssey* (*Od.*21.295-304) – appropriately enough for the sympotic context of Xenophanes' fragment, a tale itself concerned with the dangerous excesses of wine. Xenophanes' reference to the μάχας Τιτῆνων, Γιγάντων and Κενταύρων thus emblematises epic poetry as a whole, summing up the essence of the genre and its tumultuous depiction of the divine. This generic association is reinforced by the very language of these verses: the rare adjective σφεδανός ('violent') has a distinctively epic ring,<sup>98</sup> while πλάσμα<τα> τῶν προτέρων offers a playful variation on the epic phrase κλεῖα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων (*Theog.*100). Just as Pindar's predecessors in *Isthmian* 2 were pederastic poets, so too Xenophanes' πρότεροι are epic singers.

Yet Xenophanes is particularly dismissive of his πρότεροι here, especially in his description of their πλάσματα, 'fabrications'. The precise nuance of the noun is not entirely clear in this context, given that this is by far its earliest attestation. In later literature, it became a technical term for 'fiction', the narration of unreal but plausible events, set in opposition to both 'myth' and 'history'.<sup>99</sup> We should be wary of importing too much anachronistic baggage here, but given that early instances of its cognate verb πλάσσω convey a sense of deception and trickery, an association with fictionality certainly seems likely.<sup>100</sup> Alongside the dismissive οὐδὲν χρηστὸν in the following line, Xenophanes' sympotic strictures thus form part of his larger criticism of epic poetry and its main protagonists, Homer and Hesiod (cf. 21 B 11 D–K). In contrast to epic, ἀρετή and ἐσθλά have very little to do with strife and conflict in Xenophanes' world view.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>98</sup> σφεδανός occurs previously only three times in Homer (*Il.*11.165, 16.372, 21.542) and again later in several hexameter poems (Euphorion fr.11.10; Nic.*Ther.*642; Dionysius 19.fr.9v.15 GDRK).

<sup>99</sup> See Sextus Empiricus, who contrasts πλάσμα with μῦθος, the narration of what is false and has never happened, and ἱστορία, the narration of what is true and has happened (*Against the Professors* 1.263-5).

<sup>100</sup> E.g. Hes.*Op.*70; Semon.fr.7.21; Aesch.*PV.*1030; Soph.*Ajax* 148, *OT.*780; Eur.*Bacch.*218. Cf. Timon of Phlius' sarcastic use of this word in his description of Xenophanes (ὅς, τὸν ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων θεὸν ἐπλάσατ' ἴσον ἀπάντηι, 834.2 SH). On Timon's appropriation of Xenophanes' language more generally: Clayman (2009) 84.

<sup>101</sup> On this fragment's creation of a pure, civilised sympotic space: Ford (2002) 46-66. Cf. Thgn.541-42 for the ὠμοφάγοι Centaurs as an exemplum of *hybris*.

In these examples, Pindar's and Xenophanes' references to predecessors act primarily on a generic level, evoking pederastic and epic poetry as a whole. Yet as with *Pythian* 3's Iliadic citation, such polemical references to **πρότεροι** can also convey a more precise intertextual reference. In one of Mimnermus' elegiac fragments, the poet attributes his knowledge of a brave, unknown Smyrnaean to his predecessors (fr.14):

οὐ μὲν δὴ κείνου γε μένος καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμὸν  
τοῖον ἐμέο **πρωτέρων πεύθομαι**, οἳ μιν ἴδον  
Λυδῶν ἵππομάχων πυκινὰς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας  
Ἔρμιον ἄμ πεδίων, φῶτα φερεμμελίην·  
τοῦ μὲν ἄρ' οὐ ποτε πάμπαν ἐμέμψατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη  
δριμὺ μένος κραδίης, εὖθ' ὃ γ' ἀνὰ προμάχους  
σεύαιθ' αἵματόεντος ἐν> ὑσμίνῃ πολέμοιο,  
πικρὰ βιαζόμενος δυσμενέων βέλεα·  
οὐ γάρ τις κείνου δηίων ἔτ' ἀμεινότερος φῶς  
ἔσκεν ἐποίχεσθαι φυλόπιδος κρατερῆς  
ἔργον, ὅτ' αὐγῇσιν φέρετ' ὠκέος ἠελίοιο

On the face of it, this opening simply highlights the source of Mimnermus' eulogistic account, ascribing it to his elders. Yet it may also trigger recognition of an intertextual parallel that underlies the whole fragment. As Grethlein has highlighted, these verses engage extensively with the account of Diomedes' *aristeia* at Troy familiar to us from the *Iliad*.<sup>102</sup> Not only does the opening opposition of sight and hearing, alongside Mimnermus' appeal to ancestral knowledge (fr.14.1-2), echo Agamemnon's similar words when chiding Diomedes (*Il*.4.399-400), but the following description of the warrior's successes also mirror those of the Iliadic Diomedes. In particular, verses 3-4 echo the Iliadic simile in which the torrent-like hero routs the Trojans (ἄμ πεδίων, *Il*.5.87; πυκινὰ κλονέοντο φάλαγγες |, *Il*.5.93, ἄμ πεδίων...κλονέοντα φάλαγγας |, *Il*.5.96 ~ πυκινὰς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας | Ἔρμιον ἄμ πεδίων, fr.14.3-4). Alone, these verbal parallels may not be sufficient to suggest a connection with this specific mythical episode, given the formulaic nature of the language involved.<sup>103</sup> But

<sup>102</sup> Grethlein (2007) 105-8.

<sup>103</sup> πυκινὰς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας: cf. *Il*.4.281, 11.148 15.448; Hes.*Theog*.935. ἄμ πεδίων: cf. *Il*.6.71, 23.464; *Od*.5.329; *HhDem*.17; *HhAp*.228; Pind.fr.172.4.

Mimnermus' subsequent description of the warrior resonates more specifically against the fortunes of Diomedes: whereas the Iliadic hero was chided by Athena for leaving battle (*Il.*5.800-24), we are told that this Smyrnaean warrior never received such criticism from the same goddess (fr.14.5), while he is also said to defy his enemies' 'bitter missiles' (πικρὰ...βέλεα, fr.14.8), unlike the Iliadic Diomedes, who could not avoid being struck by the 'bitter arrow' of Lycaon's son (πικρὸς οἰστός, *Il.*5.99). Taken together, these pointed echoes suggest that Mimnermus' poem engages directly with the *fabula* of Diomedes' *aristeia* at Troy, an episode which Mimnermus and his audience would have likely known, whether via a version of the *Iliad* or some other source, given the poet's mention of Diomedes' unhappy nostos (fr.22) and a possible allusion to *Iliad* 6.146-49 elsewhere (fr.2), an episode in which Diomedes also plays a prominent part.<sup>104</sup> In combining these allusions together, Mimnermus enacts a game of antagonistic one-up-manship, hinting that this Smyrnaean warrior far surpasses Diomedes and that he does Homer. In introducing the mythical Greek hero as a foil for the successes of his unnamed warrior, he makes the present outdo the past, rewriting the usual epic convention of the past's superiority.<sup>105</sup> Given this larger allusive framework, we can thus see in the **πρότεροι** of verse 2 a nod to poetic – and especially epic – predecessors, whose accounts of Diomedes colour the poem as much as their reminiscences of the Smyrnaean hero described.

Alongside employing temporal adjectives and adverbs to mark their allusive engagement with earlier traditions, therefore, lyricists explicitly cited their literary predecessors. Such epigonal references were often considerably antagonistic, as with the cases of Mimnermus, Xenophanes and Pindar's first *Olympian* Ode. But they were also a means to point to specific moments in earlier traditions, as in Mimnermus and *Pythian* 3. Archaic lyricists

<sup>104</sup> Grethlein (2007) 106. On fr.2's possible allusion: §I.2.3: 46 with n.170.

<sup>105</sup> Grethlein's acceptance of Meineke's conjecture ὥς for οἷ in verse 2 would reinforce such antagonism. Mimnermus would then emphasise his own direct witnessing of the warrior, distancing himself from reliance on his πρότεροι (i.e. epic singers).

thus developed what had remained an implicit mode of figuring epigonality in archaic epic, transforming it into a direct and active trope.

### IV.3.3 Iterative Poetics

In addition to general references to the past, predecessors and priority, however, many lyricists were also deeply fascinated by the idea of repetition and recurrence. Erotic poets, in particular, constantly narrated episodes of love in a recurring iterative frame. First person speakers presented themselves as the repeated victims of passion with the particle-adverb **αὖτε** or more emphatic **δηῦτε**: Love warms Alcman's heart 'again' (**δηῦτε**, fr.59a.1); casts Ibycus 'again' into the nets of Aphrodite (**αὖτε**, fr.287.1); and 'again' causes Sappho to tremble with desire (**δηῦτε**, fr.130.1). Yet it is Anacreon who employs the motif most often: drunk with love, the poet dives 'again' from the Leucadian cliff (**δηῦτ'**, fr.376.1); seeks Pythomander's house 'again' to escape Love (**δηῦτε**, fr.400.1); is caught 'again' in the paradoxical state of loving and not loving (**δηῦτε**, fr.428.1); and is struck 'again' both by Love's purple ball (**δηῦτε**, fr.358.1) and by the smith-like god's hammer or axe (**δηῦτε**, fr.413.1).

The frequency and consistency of this motif has led Mace to identify it as 'a distinct compositional form' in lyric poetry, combining the notion of 'again' with a first-person speaker and the god 'Eros': 'love...me...again'.<sup>106</sup> As she demonstrates, it is not a static motif, but rather imbued with a variety of tones, from the pathetic to the humorous. Poets could also evoke it in other non-first-person contexts: Anacreon describes the bald Alexis as wooing 'again' (**δηῦτε**, fr.394b), and Sappho asks Abanthis to sing of the maiden Gongyla, for whom desire flies

<sup>106</sup> Mace (1993) esp.337. See now LeVen (2018) 225-32. Alcman.59a: **Ἔρωας μὲ δηῦτε**; Ibyc.fr.287: **Ἔρως αὐτέ μὲ**; Sappho fr.130: **Ἔρως δηῦτέ μ'**; Anac.fr.358: **δηῦτέ μὲ...Ἔρωας**; fr.376: **δηῦτ' ... κολυμβῶ** μεθύων **ἔρωτι**; fr.400: **δηῦτε ... κατέδυν ἔρωτα** φεύγων; fr.413: **δηῦτέ μ' Ἔρωας**; fr.428: **ἔρέω τε δηῦτε**. Cf. Ibyc.S257(a) fr.32.1 **ἦτ' ἔρω** (West (1984a) 32).



around her ‘**again**’ (here, ‘Eros...me...again’ becomes σε δηῦτε πόθος, fr.22.11).<sup>107</sup> Individually, as Mace has highlighted, all these examples of erotic recurrence play a key role in the fashioning of each speaker’s persona, presenting their personal experiences of love from a ‘veteran’s perspective.’<sup>108</sup> Yet given the repetition of the motif across a number of authors and contexts, this recurring topos can also be read on a generic level, marking – in Regina Höschele’s words – ‘the recurrence of love’s overwhelming onset throughout the genre.’<sup>109</sup> In lyric poetry, love inflicts hurt again and again. By commencing with the tag αὔτε or δηῦτε, lyric poets self-consciously acknowledge this generic reality and situate their own poems within the larger tradition of lyric love poetry.<sup>110</sup> From the perspective of reperformance, moreover, this topos of recurrence plays with the potential repeatability of each poem: every time a song is re-performed, Love’s hurt is renewed.<sup>111</sup> Lyric poets thus repeatedly gesture to the tradition as a whole, troping the very replication of this poetry as an act of iteration. We see here the dawn of a distinctively iterative poetics.

In treating this material, however, past scholars have focused primarily on the erotic sphere of lyric love poetry. This is understandable, since it is here that we have the greatest number of examples. But, on closer examination, we can see that this self-conscious iteration in fact spreads across many lyric subgenres.<sup>112</sup> Several cases also accumulate in a more general sympotic context: Anacreon asks for water and wine to be mixed in a ratio of 2:1 so that he may ‘revel **again** without hybris’ (δηῦτε, fr.356a), and in another fragment, bids his companions to abandon excessive Scythian drinking ‘**again**’ (δηῦτε, fr.356b); the same poet asks whether he won’t be allowed ‘**again**’ to go home now that he is drunk (δηῦτέ, fr.412), and

<sup>107</sup> The motif could even be evoked in other genres, e.g. πέπαλται δαῦτ’ ἐμοὶ φίλον κέαο, *Choeph* 410: Mace (1993) 353.

<sup>108</sup> Mace (1993) 338.

<sup>109</sup> Höschele (2018) §6.

<sup>110</sup> LeVen (2018) 229-30 similarly frames δηῦτε as ‘self-reflexive annotation.’

<sup>111</sup> On poetic reperformance: Hunter – Uhlig (2017).

<sup>112</sup> Mace (1993) acknowledges these other examples but relegates them to a footnote (350-51n.50) and an appendix (362-64). Cf. too the extremely fragmentary Sapph.fr.83.4 (δηῦτ’), Alc.fr.33c (δαυτ.).

may also claim that he is mad again from drink (ἐμάνην **δηῦτε** πιών, P.Mich.3250c r. col.ii.1).<sup>113</sup> Already in the seventh century, meanwhile, Alcman bids a friend ‘come **again** to the house of Cleēsippus’ (**αὔτ’**, fr.174). In each case, sympotic behaviour is presented as a recurrent event, yet each poet is also pointing to the traditionality of these elements in a sympotic context: moderate drinking and travelling to/from houses are staples of sympotic discourse.

So too in political contexts: Archilochus asks how (or where) the hapless army is assembled ‘**this time**’ (**δηῦτ’**, fr.88); Anacreon narrates how somebody ‘**again** plucks (= mocks?) the blue-shielded men of Ialysus’ (**δηῦτ’**, fr.349) and on another occasion claims that ‘**this time** I am not (obstinate?) nor easy-going with my fellow-citizens’ (**δηῦτ’**, fr.371); while elsewhere, he claims that ‘**again**’ he has put his hand through a Carian-made shield-strap (**δηῦτε**, fr.401), just as Alcaeus talks of a wave coming ‘**again**’ (**αὔ]τε**), larger than the ‘**previous**’ (**π[ρ]οτέ[ρ]ω**), evoking and recalling his own tradition of nautical imagery for political disruption (fr.6a, §III.3.1: 164-65). The world of lyric is repeatedly marked by an awareness of repetition and recurrence.

In other cases, poets even sum up the essence of their own lyric subgenres as acts of repetition: for iambus, Hipponax claims that he must ‘**once again**’ take the otherwise unknown σκότος (‘swindler’?) Merotimus to court (Μητροτίμωι **δηῦτέ** με χρὴ τῶι σκότῳ δικάζεσθαι, fr.122), an admission that has been interpreted as an ironic reference to his arch enemy Bupalus, elsewhere called a ‘mother-fucker’ (**μητροκοίτης**, fr.12.2).<sup>114</sup> His statement thus highlights the frequency with which he clashes with Bupalus in his iambs. Similarly, in Pindar’s second *Olympian*, the poet pictures himself preparing his poetic quiver and asks ‘at whom do we shoot, launching arrows of fame **again** from a kindly spirit’ (τίνα βάλλομεν | ἐκ μαλθακᾶς **αὔτε** φρενὸς εὐκλέας ὀϊστοὺς ἰέντες, *Ol.*2.89-90). Appropriately, he summarises the essence of his epinician activity with a common athletic metaphor.<sup>115</sup> In a hymnic context, meanwhile, Sappho bids the Muses ‘come **again**’, leaving a ‘golden’ location, perhaps the

<sup>113</sup> For attribution to Anacreon: Bernsdorff (2014) 7-10.

<sup>114</sup> Gerber (1999b) 455.

<sup>115</sup> Athletic metapoetics: Lefkowitz (1984); Nünlist (1998) 142-61.

house of Zeus (δεῦρο **δηῦτε** Μοῖσαι χρύσιον λίποισαι, fr.127), a request which highlights the frequency of Muse invocations not just in the literary tradition, but also in her own poetry (cf. fr.128: δευτέ νυν ἄβραι Χάριτες καλλίκομοί τε Μοῖσαι). In all these cases, the poet marks out key features of his or her lyric subgenre, self-consciously highlighting its core and recurring attributes: abuse, praise and Muse-invocation.

Taken together, these various ‘agains’ highlight a distinctly generic self-consciousness, situating each poet’s work within a pre-existing genre, defined by a series of repeating and recurring *topoi*. But it is worth asking whether we can see the establishment of any more precise intertextual connections here. It is tempting to trace a neat literary history of gradual development from a primarily generic self-consciousness in archaic lyric to a more distinctively intertextual self-consciousness in later literature.<sup>116</sup> But given the more specific intertextual connections we have already identified in epic and lyric more generally, it is worth pushing a little further. If epic poetry can employ self-conscious markers of inter- and intra-textual iteration (§IV.2.2: 198-201), why not later lyric? The extremely fragmentary nature of most of our texts makes it difficult to identify any such cases, but we can find some hints of potentially ‘iterative’ relationships, especially within an individual poet’s corpus: here, we shall explore possible examples from Sappho, Bacchylides, Pindar and Stesichorus.

Our first case is Sappho fr.1, the poet’s prayer to Aphrodite, a poem which has an incessant interest in repetition. It was most likely positioned in the opening position of the Alexandrian collection of Sappho’s works, presumably in recognition of its programmatic significance.<sup>117</sup> Sappho calls on Aphrodite to come and support her, if the goddess has ever responded to her appeals on a previous occasion (**κατέρωτα**, fr.1.5), and legitimises her request by recounting such an earlier time when the goddess did in fact visit (fr.1.15-20):

ἦἰρ' ὅττι **δηῦτε** πέπονθα κῶττι  
**δηῦτε** κἀλαῖμι  
 κῶττι μοι μάλιστ' ἔλω γένεσθαι

<sup>116</sup> In the past, I suggested such a distinction: *apud* Höschele (2018) §31n.47.

<sup>117</sup> Prodi (2017) 572-82. Dale (2015) 23-24, 29-30 expresses caution, but his alternative placement is unconvincing: the space is already filled by fr.9: West (2014b) 2; Obbink (2016a) 24, (2016b) 40.

μῆαινόλαι ἰθύμῳ· τίνα **δηῦτε** πείθω  
 .ἰ.σάγην ἰὲς σὰν φιλότατα; τίς σ', ὦ  
 Ψάπφ', ἰ.ἀδικήει;

Like on that occasion, Sappho concludes by asking Aphrodite to ‘come to me **now too**’ to free her from distress (ἔλθε μοι **καὶ νῦν**, fr.1.25). Such temporal framing is a typical part of cletic hymns, justifying present action through a past relationship (*da-quia-dedisti*).<sup>118</sup> But when set against the literary background that we have already traced, Sappho’s incessant repetition of **δηῦτε** gains a further indexical resonance, situating her poem squarely within the genre of erotic love poetry.<sup>119</sup> Indeed, if the prominent position of the poem within the Alexandrian edition of Sappho draws anything from Sappho herself, this iterative emphasis can be seen as particularly programmatic, marking her poetry within a long-standing tradition of erotic discomfort.<sup>120</sup> Building on these textual hints, Dirk Obbink has even suggested that Sappho’s appeal in fr.1 may point back to an earlier poem – an alluring suggestion.<sup>121</sup> At first sight, there is little going for it, especially given the poem’s apparent opening position at the start of the Alexandrian edition. However, Obbink supports his case by adducing evidence for variation in the ordering of Sappho’s poem in antiquity, alongside papyrological evidence of further text preceding fr.1 on an Oxyrhynchus papyrus. Other Sapphic poems, moreover, exhibit similar themes to those of fr.1, including fr.60, with the same mixture of calling, fighting and persuasion (κάλημι, 4; μάχεσθα[ι] 7; πίθειςα[ν] 8) and fr.86, another prayer to Aphrodite which may well recall an earlier occasion (αἶ **π[ο]τα κατέρωτα**, fr.86.5). In that case, our fr.1 could exemplify an ‘intertextual self-referential allusion’ to another poem with similar

<sup>118</sup> Pulleyn (1997) 16-38.

<sup>119</sup> Mace (1993) 360 has seen in the poem ‘a witty and self-reflexive allusion to the independent motif of “Eros...me, again!”’ Cf. Hutchinson (2001) 155 on potential ‘metapoetic play’.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Prodi (2017) 581. For the possibility that the ordering of Alexandrian editions may be indebted to pre-existing poetically designed structures: Clay (2011b) on Pind.*Ol.*1-3; Kelly (2017) on Sapph.fr.1.

<sup>121</sup> Obbink (2011) 33-38.

themes.<sup>122</sup> In many ways, this is an attractive hypothesis, but it cannot be anything more than speculation on current evidence. The papyrological evidence, in particular, is not watertight: the preceding text could simply be prefatory material, or a poem from later in the papyrus (depending on which way it had been rolled). We cannot rule out an intertextual resonance, therefore, but it may be safer to see in Sappho's hymnic appeal a generic case of never-ending love writ large, highlighting the constant merry-go-round of love.

We are on firmer ground, however, in a number of cases where epinician poets appear to self-consciously mark their poems as repeats, following in the tracks of previous ones. In Bacchylides 12, the poet bids the Muse Clio steer his mind now **'if ever you did before also'** (εἰ δὴ ποτε καὶ πάρος, Bacchyl.12.4). As in Sappho fr.1, this hymnic *clesis* extends beyond its religious function, inviting the Muse and audience to recall earlier poetry in which Clio had been invoked (e.g. Κλεοῖ, Bacchyl.3.3, 468 BCE; Κλειώ, 13.9, Κλειώ, 13.228: 480s BCE).<sup>123</sup> In Bacchylides fr.20c (470 BCE?), the poet similarly intends to send a song for Hieron **'if ever before** I sang the praises of Pherenicus who won the victory with his swift feet (both at Delphi) and by the Alpheus' (εἰ καὶ | πρὸς θεν ὑμνήσας τὸν [ἐν Δελφοῖς θ' ἐλοντα | πο]σὶ λαῖψ[η]ρο[ῖ]ς Φερ[ένικον ἐπ' Ἀλ-]|φ[ει]ῶι τε ν[ί]καν, Bacchyl.fr.20c.7-10, suppl. Snell). This retrospective glance may well look back to Bacchylides 5 (476 BCE), a poem that similarly celebrated the horse's double victory and unmatched speech (esp. Bacchyl.5.37-41 Φερ[ένικον | Ἀλφεὸν παρ' εὐρυδίναν ἀέλλοδρομαν... νικάσαντα... Πυθωνί τ' ἐν ἀγαθέαι).<sup>124</sup> The opening of Bacchylides 4 (470 BCE), meanwhile, sets itself firmly against a tradition of earlier celebrations: the city of Syracuse is **'still'** loved by Apollo (ἔτι, Bacchyl.4.1); Hieron is **'hymned for the third time'** at Delphi (τρίτον...ἀ[είδε]ται, Bacchyl.4.4-5); and the poet claims that **'the sweet-voiced cock of lyre-ruling Urania cried out once before'** (ποτέ, Bacchyl.4.7-9,

<sup>122</sup> Obbink (2011) 33. I am unconvinced by Obbink's reconstruction of the earlier poem, which presupposes too mechanical a process of 'copy and paste' (p.38).

<sup>123</sup> Cf. Spelman (2018a) 226. Dating of Bacchyl.3: Cairns (2010) 129-36.

<sup>124</sup> Cingano (1991); Maehler (2004) 251-52; Spelman (2018a) 227.

suppl. Snell, Maas, Maehler) – another possible back-reference to Bacchylides 5.<sup>125</sup> Pindar, too, makes such self-reflexive cross-references: in *Isthmian* 6, he explicitly marks his celebration of Phylacidas' boys' pancratium victory as a sequel to his previous poem for Phylacidas' brother Pytheas, *Nemean* 5 (δεύτερον, 6.2; αὖτε, 6.5).<sup>126</sup> And he begins *Pythian* 6 by explicitly marking his act of repetition: 'we are **again** ploughing the field of rolling-eyed Aphrodite and the Graces, approaching the sacred navel of the thundering earth' (ἀναπολίζομεν, *Pyth.* 6.1-3). As scholars have noted, this emphasis on iteration looks back to the poet's invocation of the same combination of goddesses in the proem of *Paeon* 6, an earlier poem in which he similarly approached (προσοιχόμενοι, *Pyth.* 6.3 ~ ἦλθον *Pae.* 6.9) the navel of the earth (ὀμφαλὸν...χθονός, *Pyth.* 6.2-3 ~ χθονός ὀμφαλόν, *Pae.* 6.17). The invocation of the gods simultaneously invites an audience to recall Pindar's earlier poem, here marked not by a temporal adverb but the iterative prefix ἀνα-.<sup>127</sup> Repeatedly in epinician poetry, therefore, poets acknowledge their previous work as a starting point for the present, not only displaying their own impressive credentials, but also emphasising the enduring success of their *laudandi*.

As a final example of such literary repetition, however, we should turn to Stesichorus' *Palinode*, a notoriously controversial text whose precise nature and arrangement are uncertain. Based on conflicting ancient testimony, scholars disagree whether we should conceive of one or two *Palinodes* and whether one (or both) of these should be regarded as identical to the Stesichorean poem elsewhere called the *Helen*.<sup>128</sup> The issue is irretractable on current evidence, and any proposed solution depends on how one weighs up a mass of inconsistent, unclear and unreliable sources.<sup>129</sup> For our purposes, however, we only need note that Stesichorus produced different poems (or portions of a single poem) that offered contradictory views on Helen: in

<sup>125</sup> Maehler (2004) 103; Morrison (2007b) 88; Spelman (2018a) 227. Contrast Catenacci – Di Marzio (2004) 74-76. Cf. Bacchyl. 6, which contrasts previous songs (ἄεισάν ποτ' Ὀλύμπια, 6.6) with the present (σὲ δὲ νῦν, 6.10).

<sup>126</sup> Spelman (2018a) 226-27, further noting the emphasis on the 'family's cumulative epinician haul' in *Isth.* 6.62-64.

<sup>127</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1908) 345; Gentili (1988) 278n.60; Hubbard (1991) 38-39.

<sup>128</sup> For discussion: Bowra (1963); Sider (1989); Kelly (2007b); Davies and Finglass (2014) 308-17.

<sup>129</sup> Wright (2005) 87-110 offers a particularly damning survey of our evidence. On the biographical focus of Chamaeleon, cited as a key source for the existence of two *Palinodes* (fr.90.10-11): Schorn (2007).

the first (which I shall call the *Helen*), she was the archetypal adulterer of the epic tradition, one of Tyndareus' polygamous and unfaithful daughters (διγάμους τε καὶ τριγάμους... ἢ καὶ λιπεσάνορας, fr. 85.4-5); in the second (which I shall call the *Palinode*), she was recast as blameless, having neither set sail in Paris' ships nor arrived in Troy. It was in fact only a phantom (*eidolon*) of Helen that Paris took to Troy, while the heroine herself stayed behind with Proteus in Egypt (fr.90.11-15). In a terse fragment, the poet famously acknowledges his departure from tradition (fr.91a):

οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος **λόγος** οὗτος,  
οὐδ' ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν ἐϋσσελμοῖς,  
οὐδ' ἵκεο Πέργαμα Τροίας·

As it stands, this is a radical revision. Stesichorus not only recants his earlier account in the *Helen*, but also rewrites the whole epic tradition – undermining one of its core moments, the very event that catalysed the entire Trojan war.<sup>130</sup> In language that pointedly appropriates epic phraseology (especially the common noun-epithet phrase νῆες ἐϋσσελμοῖς), Stesichorus sets himself against the likes of Homer and Hesiod, the major epicists who preserved the traditional account. In this poem, he is as antagonistic towards the world of epic as the sympotic Xenophanes.<sup>131</sup>

The recantation itself, whether it formed an independent poem or a new section of a larger work, apparently began with an invocation to a goddess (fr.90.8-9):

δεῦρ' αὖτε θεὰ φιλόμολπε

<sup>130</sup> It is unclear whether Stesichorus invented the *eidolon* motif. According to a Byzantine paraphrase of Lycophron's *Alexandra*, he was pre-empted (and inspired?) by Hesiod (fr.dub.358), but there are strong grounds for doubting this: Davies – Finglass (2014) 302-3.

<sup>131</sup> Cf. Beecroft (2006) 67: 'boarding a broad-benched ship metonymically means entering the epic tradition... Ultimately, the *logos* that is not *etumos* is the epic tradition itself.' On the poem's generic rivalry with epic: Beecroft (2010) 144-70, esp. 164-70.

The identity of this goddess is unclear from the fragment alone, but given the adjective φιλόμολπε, it is most likely a Muse, rather than Helen herself.<sup>132</sup> What immediately concerns us here, however, is the temporal specificity of the adverb αὖτε: like Sappho and the epinician poets, Stesichorus asks a goddess to visit him ‘again’. As with the Sapphic fragments (fr.1, fr.127), this αὖτε could be little more than a reciprocal prayer formula, recognising the generic frequency of such invocations, as Davies and Finglass suggest: for them, the adverb ‘acknowledges that the poet regularly invokes the Muse, and implies his hope that she will assist him now as before’.<sup>133</sup> However, given the more specific context of the *Palinode*, explicitly following and correcting the version of events in the *Helen*, there are strong grounds for seeing αὖτε here as a specific back-reference to Stesichorus’ ‘traditional’ presentation of his protagonist in the *Helen*.<sup>134</sup> In so doing, Stesichorus would be casting the *Palinode* as secondary and derivative, directly linking it to his previous treatment of the myth, just as Hesiod appears to correct his Theogonic description of Eris at the start of the *Works and Days*.<sup>135</sup> In short, αὖτε marks Stesichorus’ return to and reversal of (πάλιν-) the same topic in another ode (-ᾠδή) – a pointedly intertextual case of allusive iteration.

However, it is unnecessary to choose between the generic or intertextual significance of αὖτε. Both are surely active at the very same time in this poem: on the one hand, Stesichorus explicitly signposts his revision of his earlier *Helen*, but he also signals the traditionality of Muse invocations in general, reinforcing his appropriation of the epic tradition. Although Stesichorus may refer primarily to his own Muse invocations (e.g. fr.277), an awareness of the trope’s traditionality cannot but evoke the epic genre, in which the Muses played a significant role. Stesichorus’ iterative emphasis may thus also nod to epic tradition at large, setting himself against the habits of Homer and Hesiod. Indeed, the papyrus commentary which preserves

---

<sup>132</sup> Bowra (1963) 246. Though if Helen were addressed (cf. the second person address in fr.91a), this would support the arguments of Carruesco (2017) that Helen adopts the role of the Muses in this poem and of Kelly (2007b) that the *Palinode* involved an epic-style epiphanic encounter with Helen.

<sup>133</sup> Davies – Finglass (2014) 331.

<sup>134</sup> Bowra (1963) 246; Feeney (1991) 15.

<sup>135</sup> *Op.*11-26, *Theog.*225-26: §I.2.3: 49 with n.184.



this verse claims that Stesichorus explicitly opposed himself to Homer in one *Palinode* and Hesiod in another ([μέμ]φεται τὸν Ὅμηρο[ν]...τὸν Ἡσίοδ[ον] μέμ[φεται], fr.90). This – of course – does not prove that these foremost representatives of the epic tradition were mentioned by name in the poem(s), given that an ancient commentator could have simply interpreted them as the implicit target of Stesichorus' critique.<sup>136</sup> But Plato's narrative of Stesichorus' blinding does at least suggest some direct competitiveness with Homer: whereas Stesichorus discovered the cause of his blindness by being μουσικός and resolved it by recanting his *Helen* (he was not ignorant: οὐκ ἠγνόησεν), Homer remained unaware (οὐκ ᾔσθετο) and blind (Pl.*Phaedr.*243a). If this derives at all from Stesichorus' poem, as has been plausibly argued, we would thus have a clear case of Stesichorean poetic one-up-manship.<sup>137</sup> In asking the Muse to come 'again', the poet not only contrasts the *Palinode*'s account with that of his earlier *Helen*, but also with the epic tradition as a whole: the Muse comes again, as she repeatedly does, but now for a very different purpose.

In any case, however we decide to interpret this iterative marker, questions must remain over the simplicity or sincerity of this opposition with epic. As scholars have noted, Stesichorus' οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος (fr.91a.1) is strikingly close to Penelope's words in the *Odyssey* when she (wrongly) refuses to accept the reality of Odysseus' return: ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅδε μῦθος ἐτήτυμος (*Od.*23.62). As Carruesco has argued, this 'textual allusion to Penelope's manifestly false words in the *Odyssey* undermines the assertion "this is not a true story" and leaves open the possibility of viewing the *Palinode* as a *dissoi logoi* structure, where truth and untruth are not as clear-cut as we are being told.'<sup>138</sup> Like the Muses in Hesiod's *Theogony*, who can so readily mix truth and fiction (*Theog.*27-28), so too here the Muse whom Stesichorus invokes seems very capable of blurring the truth. In calling the same Muse to return and legitimise a radically different version of the Helen myth, Stesichorus problematises the tensions inherent in the Muses' authority – how can we trust them if they can tell such varied tales? Like Pindar in *Olympian* 1, who complicates his dismissal of his predecessors by

<sup>136</sup> Cf. §I.2.3: 43. West (1985) 134; Carruesco (2017) 178n.3; Rawles (2018) 24.

<sup>137</sup> Kelly (2007).

<sup>138</sup> Carruesco (2017) 192.

describing their lies as he does his own poetry (§IV.3.2: 220n.97), so too here, Stesichorus challenges the distinction of truth and falsity. Poetry and tradition repeat themselves, and in so doing, the true story can easily get lost.

Stesichorus' Palinode thus offers the most extreme case of a larger trend of repetition and recurrence in Greek lyric. Our extant fragments are dominated by an iterative poetics, in which the repetitive nature of poetic composition and key generic *topoi* are stressed. A wide range of lyricists highlight both the repeatability of generic conventions and the potential re-performance of their own poems. Alongside appeals to former times and former poets, this recurring emphasis on repetition demonstrates that time was a key trope to articulate allusive relationships in lyric poetry. With a keen awareness of their literary heritage, Greek lyricists appealed to both generic conventions and their predecessors as a source of authority or contention, and in so doing, they marked out their own distinctive place in the map of literary history.

## IV.4 Conclusions

In archaic epic and lyric, therefore, temporality frequently serves as an index of allusion. We have seen how temporal adjectives and adverbs repeatedly signpost engagement with earlier mythological and poetic traditions, often inviting an audience to supplement bare references with their wider knowledge of tradition. Yet in addition, both corpora of poetry exhibit a strong interest in the iterative aspects of poetic composition: Homeric epic frequently marks cross-references within individual poems as acts of repetition, while lyric poets flag their compositions as self-conscious replays of tradition, or even specific prior poems.

Such temporal indexes bear an implicit sense of epigonality, as epic and lyric poets situate their own poetry against a wider, pre-existing tradition. But such an anxiety of influence particularly comes into play surrounding the discourse of *πρότεροι*. In epic, inter-generational tensions in the mythical world serve as a model for the poet's own relationship with his tradition, while in lyric, this concern becomes explicit, as poets repeatedly evoke their *πρότεροι* directly, often pointing to specific texts, and frequently in a deeply agonistic manner.

The various categories of temporal indexes with which we began, therefore, can already be found throughout archaic Greek poetry, reinforcing the conclusions we have drawn from our explorations of indexical hearsay and memory. Archaic Greek poets already display a strong sense of literary history, situating their present against the poetic and mythological past, and figuring this relationship through a range of temporal indexes: indexical temporality was deeply embedded in archaic Greek poetics from the very start.

Given the recurring prominence of indexes in archaic Greek poetry, it is time to turn to some broader conclusions. These will be the concern of the epilogue.



## **PART V.**

## **EPILOGUE**



οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν  
 ἡρώων, ὅτε κέν τιν' ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἴκοι·  
 δωρητοὶ τε πέλοντο παρὰρρητοὶ τ' ἐπέεσσι.  
 μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον ἐγὼ πάλαι οὗ τι νέον γε  
 ὥς ἦν· ἐν δ' ὑμῖν ἐρέω πάντεσσι φίλοισι.

So Phoenix introduces his famous Meleager exemplum in the *Iliad* (Il.9.524-28), combining in a single passage all three indexes of allusion which we have explored in this study: he has '**heard the glories**' of past men (ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα); he '**remembers**' the deed (μέμνημαι); and the event is '**of considerable antiquity**' (πάλαι οὗ τι νέον), the preserve of '**heroes of a former age**' (τῶν πρόσθεν...ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων). Through this unparalleled accumulation of indexes, Phoenix (alongside Homer) marks the subsequent account as traditional and familiar, drawing on the mythological tradition, while also perhaps authorising his apparently novel treatment of the myth.<sup>1</sup> Poet and speaker self-consciously tap into an encyclopaedic network of myths and traditions. If these five verses were to be found in a Latin poem, scholars would have long celebrated them as the epitome of self-conscious indexicality, a clearly signposted citation of tradition.

By now, we have established that the marking of allusion was already deeply engrained in archaic Greek poetics. Epic and lyric poets employed indexes of hearsay, memory and time to position themselves within and against their larger tradition, carving out their own distinctive space. What is most striking, however, is the extent to which archaic poets employed these devices. The previous sections have explored numerous cases of indexicality in action: of poets nodding to other traditions and texts; inviting their audiences to acknowledge competing alternatives or supplement unspoken details; and legitimising their departures from tradition with the veneer of traditional authority. From Homer onwards,

---

<sup>1</sup> For Meleager, cf. Il.2.642; Hes.fr.25.11-13 (NB ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, fr.25.11 ~ Il.9.524-25), fr.280; the Pronomos vase. On the *Iliad* 9 paradigm: Kakridis (1949) 11-42; Willcock (1964) 141-54; Swain (1988); Burgess (2017). Phoenix may also self-consciously acknowledge the frequency of the wrath theme: cf. Kelly (2007a) 97-98; Achilles, Il.1.1, *passim.*; Paris, Il.6.326-41; Aeneas, Il.13.458-69; Demeter, *HhDem*: Lord (1967); Nickel (2003).

archaic poets were engaged in a sophisticated and well-developed allusive system. Although they are dated to the 'archaic' age, there is nothing 'primitive' about their poetic practice.

To close this study, I would like to take a step back and address two broader issues that arise from this project. First, I will return to the question with which we began and ask how this exploration of early Greek indexicality impacts our understanding of allusion in ancient Greece and Rome (§V.1). And second, I will situate the fruits of this research within a broader narrative of literary history, one which spans multiple cultures and media (§V.2).

### **V.1 Allusion: Greece and Rome**

A key point that has emerged from this study is the similarity between allusive marking in archaic poetry and that of later literary cultures. To return to the question with which we opened, we must conclude that indexicality functions in a very similar manner in both archaic Greek and later Roman poetry. Of course, this does not mean that the allusive systems of Greece and Rome were identical or that they remained unchanged for centuries. We have already tracked changes in the nature of intertextuality within the archaic period alone (§I.2.3: 42-53). But what is striking is how, despite these developments in allusive practice, indexicality remains a constant. Even as the target of allusion may shift from mythological traditions to specific texts, the very same allusive strategies are employed.

Of course, this argument for continuity should not be mistaken as a claim for uniformity in the use of indexicality throughout archaic poetry. In the previous sections, we have noted considerable variation in the use of different indexes. Hearsay and temporality are prominent throughout archaic epic and lyric, although the differing constructions of the narrator in each corpus result in some differences, especially in their varying direct engagement with poetic πρότεροι. Poetic memory, by contrast, is largely the preserve of Homeric epic, a result – as we have seen – of its plentiful opportunities for embedded character speech.



A further detail which we have not yet remarked upon, however, is the apparent scarcity of such indexes in archaic iambus. In the foregoing sections, we have not cited a single iambic example. Archilochus' name has been mentioned, but only in relation to his elegies on Telephus and Heracles. If we were to look for an iambic instance of indexicality, our best example would be Archilochus' explicit citation of fables as αἶνοι. He self-consciously introduces his account of the fox and eagle as 'a fable told among men' (αἰνός τις ἀνθρώπων ὅδε, fr.174.1) and claims that he will tell his addressee Cerycides another 'fable', that of the fox and the monkey (ἐρέω τιν' ὑμῖν αἶνον, ὦ Κηρυκίδη, fr.185.1). Such explicit citations of αἶνοι appear to have been an established part of the handling of fable,<sup>2</sup> but the former example is particularly interesting given its specification of an audience of ἄνθρωποι, a noun which we have elsewhere seen combined with other allusive indexes.<sup>3</sup> In this case, too, Archilochus' pretensions of following a well-known αἶνος are confirmed by the remaining words of the fragment, which closely paraphrase the beginning of Aesop's version of the same fable (ὥς ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ καίετος συνέωνίην | ἔμειξαν, fr.174.2-3 ~ ἀετός καὶ ἀλώπηξ φιλίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ποιησάμενοι, *fab.1* Perry).<sup>4</sup> More generally, the antiquity of the tale is supported by its well-known connections with Near Eastern myth, especially that of Etana: the fable has a long and established heritage.<sup>5</sup> By explicitly introducing his fable as an αἶνος, Archilochus is doing something comparable to his peers in other genres, signposting his allusive adoption of another tradition.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. αἶνον...ἐρέω, Hes.*Op.*202; αἰνός τις ἐστίν, Panarc.fr.1(a) *IEG*; ἦν ἄρα τρανὸς αἶνος ἀνθρώπων ὅδε, Moschion I.97.fr.8.1 *TrGF*; Adrados (1956) 28-30. Cf. Archil.fr.23.16 (λόγω, indexing the fable of the ant and dove); Archil.fr.168.2-3 (χοῦμά τοι γελοῖον | ἐρέω).

<sup>3</sup> *SH.2.2*: 67-68. On the meaningful ambiguity of the genitive (subjective: 'told by men' vs. objective: 'about men'): Corrêa (2007) 103-4; Swift (2014a) 70.

<sup>4</sup> The text of this fable is late, written probably between the first and third centuries CE, but an earlier Aesopic version is attested by Aristophanes (*Av.*651-53): West (1984b); Corrêa (2007) 103. On Archilochus' allusive use of αἶνοι: Swift (2014a); Brown (2018) 31-41; Carey (2018) 22-25. On his handling of this fable: van Dijk (1997) 138-44; Irwin (1998); Hawkins (2008) 93-101; Gagné (2009).

<sup>5</sup> Williams (1956); Trencsényi-Waldapfel (1959); Baldi (1961); Adrados (1964); La Penna (1964); Burkert (1992) 122-23; Corrêa (2007) 105-108; Currie (forthcoming).

Such signposting of iambic fable, however, only throws into greater relief the absence of indexicality in iambic allusions to mythical tales. Scholars have plausibly argued for various allusions to myth in iambus, especially to the Homeric Odysseus.<sup>6</sup> But as far as we can see, these were not indexically marked. The fragmentary state of our evidence may again be to 'blame'.<sup>7</sup> But this balance may also reflect something of iambus' generic composition and self-perception. The genre may have only flagged its engagement with 'lower', more popular genres. This would contrast significantly with archaic elegy, which was more concerned with establishing a storehouse of wisdom, and melic lyric, with its focus on myths as exempla for the present. Iambus, by contrast, appears to have focused on *ainoi*, and it is these that the genre indexically marks. What poets indexed, as much as how they did so, is thus illuminating for our understanding of ancient genres and our appreciation of how ancient poets fashioned themselves within their tradition.

Despite these variations, however, indexicality remains remarkably constant across the texts that we have studied in this project. Indexes of allusion proved a crucial tool for gesturing to the authority of an emerging canon, as poets variously appropriated, challenged and revised tradition. If space had permitted, it would have been illuminating to extend this study further and explore how such variation continued into Attic drama and prose, corpora where scholars have identified a similar process of (often agonistic) intertextuality.<sup>8</sup> However, by focusing here on the most controversial period of allusion in the ancient Graeco-Roman world, we have been able to establish a more forcible case for continuity. The deep presence of indexes in archaic Greek poetry radically affects our appreciation of ancient literary history and the

---

<sup>6</sup> Archilochus: Seidensticker (1978); Swift (2012). Hipponax: Degani (1984) 187-205; Miralles – Pòrtulas (1988) 77-83; Rosen (1990a); Carey (2008) 95-99; Steiner (2009), (2011); Cazzato (2015); Alexandrou (2016a); Hawkins (2016). Though note the caution of Kelly (forthcoming).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Alexandrou (2016b) 211.

<sup>8</sup> Tragedy: Garner (1990); Swift (2010); Torrance (2013). Comedy: Kugelmeier (1996); Montana (2009); Zogg (2014); Farmer (2017). Prose histories: Condilo (2017). Also relevant would be philosophers' (mis)quotations of poets: Labarbe (1949); Tarrant (1951); Benardete (1963); Lohse (1964-67); Halliwell (2000); Yamagata (2012).

capabilities of archaic poetics. From Homer onwards, archaic poets self-consciously indexed a host of other texts and traditions.

## V.2 A Broader Perspective

When situating early Greek indexicality within a wider context, however, we should not restrict our gaze to Rome. The evidence of other media and cultures also enhances our understanding of this phenomenon. The plausibility of such elaborate indexing in an oral poetic environment, for example, is reinforced by more modern oral traditions, where we can identify similar cases of allusive signposting. A Bosnian song by Mehmed Kolaković may serve as an example: in an extensive analepsis, the principal hero Stojan Janković recalls his own life story as a prelude to a new adventure (*Janković Stojan i Hodžić Husein*, *HNP* III.18.52-122). As Danek has recently emphasised, this recalled tale was ‘one of the most famous stories of the whole South-Slavic epic tradition, *The Captivity of Stojan Janković*, which “every singer can sing and every child can retell”.<sup>9</sup> It would have been very familiar to Kolaković’s audiences. And indeed, as Danek has highlighted, the poet explicitly marks it as such: Janković begins his account by remarking that ‘**You, too, know** [it], you sirdars of Kotar’ (**I vi znate**, kotarski serdari’, *HNP* III.18.44).<sup>10</sup> As in Greek epic and lyric, a character’s acknowledgement of his internal audience’s knowledge signposts the external audience’s own familiarity with the tale. In addition, we could note that the narrative proper begins with a temporal index, further marking the ensuing story as a familiar part of the poetic and historical past (**Once upon a time** I summoned an army,’ ‘Ja sam **jednoč** vojsku podignuo’, *HNP* III.18.61). Archaic Greek poetry’s indexing of pre-existing tradition is thus closely paralleled by the allusive techniques of more contemporary oral traditions. This lends support to the notion that indexicality is not intimately tied to literacy, but can function in more oral poetic environments.

---

<sup>9</sup> Danek (2016) 133; and 138-42 for the larger significance of the allusion.

<sup>10</sup> Danek (2016) 133 with n.24.

Rather than looking forward to more modern cultures, however, we can also look back to the distant past. Early Greek indexicality is also paralleled by the allusive practices of the ancient Near East, a fact that further cements the plausibility of the phenomenon in archaic Greece. Currie has recently highlighted one comparable example in the Babylonian epic *Gilgamesh*, in which the hero claims that he has come to the famous Ūta-napišti (SB X.249-50):

[<sup>d</sup>]GIŠ-gim-maš ana šá-šu-ma izakkara(mu)<sup>ra</sup> ana <sup>m</sup>UD-napi[šti(zi)]  
[ana]-ku um-ma lul-lik-ma <sup>m</sup>UD-napišti ru-qa ša **i-dab-bu-bu-uš lu-mur**

Gilgameš said to him, to Ūta-napišti:

I thought, 'I will go and find Ūta-napišti the Far-Away, **of whom people talk**'.

As Currie remarks, this comment 'may be taken as a ('metapoetic') signal to Utanapishtim/Atrahasis, familiar from earlier poetry...as the model for Gilgamesh's quest for immortality'.<sup>11</sup> But it also acknowledges the poet's more general debt to the story of the flood from the *Atra-ḫasīs* epic. As George notes, Tablet XI offers 'a straightforward and sometimes verbatim adaptation of part of that poem.'<sup>12</sup> By highlighting the pre-existing fame of Ūta-napišti, the poet signposts his allusive debt. Indexical hearsay is not purely the preserve of the Graeco-Roman world.

However, Currie's one example is not in fact an isolated incident in this poem: we can identify a number of other cases where the *Gilgamesh* poet highlights the traditionality of his tale. On the Yale Old Babylonian tablet, before setting out to fight the giant Huwawa in the cedar wood, Gilgamesh describes his opponent in very similar terms (OB III col.v.182-83):<sup>13</sup>

ilam (dingir) {GIŠ} ša **i-qá-ab-bu-ú lu-mu-ur**  
ša šu-um-šu it-ta-nam-ba-la ma-ta-tum

<sup>11</sup> Currie (2012) 566n.122; cf. (2016) 143. Like Odysseus and Jason's Argo (*Od.*12.70), Currie notes that Gilgamesh cannot follow fully in Ūta-napišti's footsteps, since he is unable to attain immortality.

<sup>12</sup> George (2003) I.18. Cf. Tigay (1982) 214-40. For the equation of Ūta-napišti and Atra-ḫasīs, see *SB*.XI.49, XI.197.

<sup>13</sup> Helle (forthcoming) n.34 notes this repetition as part of a larger parallelism and mirroring between the two halves of the poem (Huwawa ~ Ūta-napišti): we might compare the narrative doublets of Greek epic.

I will see the god **of whom they speak**,  
whose name the lands do constantly repeat

And the elders of Uruk too claim they have ‘heard of him’ (OB III col.v.193-94):

*ni-ši-em-me-ma dĥu-wa-wa ša-nu-ú bu-nu-šu*  
*ma-an-nu-um š[a i-m] a-ĥa-ru ka-ak-ki-šu*

**We hear of Huwawa**, (that) he is strange of visage:  
Who is there who can withstand his weapons?

Within the story world, these assertions of Huwawa’s fame reflect the notoriety of the monster, but they also nod to the creature’s traditionality: Gilgamesh’s encounter with the ogre was the most popular of the separate older Sumerian tales of Gilgamesh that were later combined into the Old and Standard Babylonian versions.<sup>14</sup> By emphasising Huwawa as an object of hearsay, the Gilgamesh poet acknowledges the familiar tradition upon which he builds. In addition, he also establishes a prototype for the fame that Gilgamesh wishes to achieve through his own deeds: just like an Iliadic hero, Gilgamesh is concerned with what men will say about him in the future (OB III col.iii.148-9) and longs to ‘establish a name that is eternal forever’ (*šu-ma ša da-ru-ú a-na-ku lu-uš-ta-ak-na*, OB III col.iii.160, cf.188). Already in Babylonian literature, we thus find significant precedent for Early Greek indexicality.

But what is the significance of these parallels? On the one hand, they may support the argument of those scholars who see a direct influence of the Babylonian *Gilgamesh* on Greek epic.<sup>15</sup> After all, such a concern with tradition and fame appears to have been a distinctive feature of the Gilgamesh myth in the Near East, not readily shared by other literary texts. Perhaps the best parallel would be the wisdom composition *Šimâ Milka*, which is introduced as the advice of a certain **Šūpê-amēli** (‘most famous of men’). Cohen has recently suggested

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Michalowski (2010) 18. On the Sumerian poem: Edzard (1990), (1991); Civil (2003); George (2003) I.9-10. Fleming – Milstein (2010) postulate an independent Akkadian Huwawa tale as a source alongside the Sumerian version.

<sup>15</sup> West (1997) 334-437, (2018); Currie (2012), (2016) 169-222.

that this name may allude to the famous Šuruppak, whose ‘Instructions’ were a thematically similar work.<sup>16</sup> As the oldest known Mesopotamian wisdom composition, the ‘Instructions of Šuruppak’ would certainly be a natural (and ‘famous’) model for *Šimâ Milka*, indexed by the ‘speaking name’ *Šûpê-amêli*, but as Cohen himself recognises, the grounds are not particularly strong. In Near East literary culture, signposting allusive engagement with tradition thus seems to be a distinctive feature of the *Gilgamesh* epic.

However, it would be overly reductive to argue from this shared indexicality that the Babylonian *Gilgamesh* must be the source of Greek epic’s allusive practices. For a start, the Near Eastern text focuses only on fame and hearsay as indexes of allusion, with no comparable cases of indexical memory and temporality. This is perhaps unsurprising: we have noted the conspicuous absence of the Muses in Near Eastern literature, and the concomitant disinterest in bardic memory. The major indexes that we have detected in archaic Greek poetry, therefore, cannot simply have been imported from the Near East. Even more significantly, however, allusive indexes appear to exist in literature of various periods and cultures. We have already noted the Bosnian song of Mehmed Kolaković, but we can add numerous other examples, ranging from other oral traditions,<sup>17</sup> medieval epics,<sup>18</sup> Elizabethan theatre,<sup>19</sup> and even ‘modern’ fiction across various media: novels, poetry, films, musicals and more.<sup>20</sup> Such self-conscious

---

<sup>16</sup> Cohen (2013) 116-17; thematic similarities: 118-19.

<sup>17</sup> E.g. *Manas* by a Kara-Kirghiz bard, Sagymbai Orozbekov (1867-1930): ‘All happened **very long ago**... This is a **tale of long past years**’: Bowra (1952) 41.

<sup>18</sup> The Old High German *Hildegardslied* begins *Ik gihorta ðat seggen* (‘I’ve heard it said’); the Nordic *Atlamáli in Grænlenzko* begins *Frétt hefir öld* (‘the world has heard’): Niles (1983) 51.

<sup>19</sup> Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra* 2.2.195-8 (Agrippa: ‘There she appeared indeed; or **my reporter** devised well for her’) ~ Plutarch, *Life of Antony* 26: Lyne (2000) 151-52.

<sup>20</sup> Novels: e.g. Henry Fielding, *Joseph Andrews* (1742) book IV, ch.4 (‘Madam, this is that charming Pamela, of whom I am convinced **you have heard so much**’) ~ Samuel Richardson, *Pamela* (1740): Currie (2016) 143-44. Poetry: Keats, *Ode to Psyche* 2 ... (‘sweet enforcement and **remembrance** dear’) ~ Milton, *Lycidas* 6 (‘Bitter constraint, and sad occasion dear’: Hartman (1983) 217; Hinds (1998) 1. Films: e.g. ‘easter-egging’ in the ‘Marvel Cinematic Universe’. Musicals: e.g. in *Wicked*, ‘Defying Gravity’ (Elphaba: ‘**as someone told me lately**, everyone deserves the chance to fly’) ~ *Wicked*, ‘A Sentimental Man’ (Wizdard: ‘I think everyone deserves the chance to fly’).

signposting and figuring of literary relations appears to be part and parcel of how literature works.

In its extensive and embedded employment of indexicality, archaic Greek poetry thus belongs in a long continuum of literary expression that can be traced from (at least) ancient Babylon to the modern day. This is, of course, not to eclipse or flatten changes of focus and emphasis over time, but nor is it to argue for continuous and progressive development across the ages. Indeed, if anything, our classical examples of allusive marking (both Greek and Roman) stand out for their remarkable intensity and quantity. The literature of these cultures was deeply invested in situating itself within larger traditions of literary history and signposting its allusive manoeuvres. No less than their Roman successors, our earliest known Greek poets were capable of a complex and sophisticated range of allusive techniques, self-consciously appropriating their predecessors' work to mark out their own space in the literary tradition. In so doing, archaic poets produced compositions that were not only elaborate and sophisticated in their own right, but also part of a larger poetic tradition – a tradition that bridges many cultures and millennia.





# Bibliography

## Texts and Editions

Unless otherwise noted, I follow the text and enumeration of the following editions:

- Babylonian Gilgamesh*: George (2003) for text and translation.
- Iliad*: West (1998–2000). *Odyssey*: West (2017). Homeric scholia: Erbse (1969–88) for the *Iliad*, Pontani (2007–) for *Od.* 1–6, Dindorf (1855) for the remainder. Eustathius: van der Valk (1971–87) for the *Iliad* [VdV], Stallbaum (1825–26) for the *Odyssey*. Homeric Hymns: West (2003a). Epic fragments: West (2003b) [GEF]. Hesiod: Solmsen (1990). Hesiodic fragments: Merkelbach and West *apud* Solmsen (1990). Hesiodic scholia: Pertusi (1955) for the *Works and Days*, Di Gregorio (1975) for the *Theogony*.
- Iambic and elegiac poets: West (1989–92) [IEG], with Archilochus' Telephus elegy as fr. 17a (following Swift (forthcoming)). Alcman and Ibycus: Davies (1988) [PMGF]. Stesichorus: Davies and Finglass (2014). Sappho and Alcaeus: Voigt (1971). Anacreon: Page (1962) [PMG]. Simonides: Page (1962) for lyric [PMG], West (1989–92) for elegy [IEG]. Pindar: Snell and Maehler (1987–89). Pindaric scholia: Drachmann (1997). Bacchylides: Snell and Maehler (1970).
- Aeschylus: Page (1972). Sophocles: Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990). Sophoclean scholia: Xenis (2010a) for the *Electra*, Xenis (2010b) for the *Trachiniae*, Xenis (2018) for *Oedipus at Colonus*, Papageorgiou (1888) for the remainder. Euripides: Diggle (1981–94). Euripidean scholia: Schwartz (1887–91). Tragic Fragments: Snell et al. (1971–2004) [TrGF]. Aristophanes: Wilson (2007). Aristophanic scholia: Koster and Holwerda (1960–2007). Comic Fragments: Kassel and Austin (1983–) [K–A].
- Early Greek Mythographers (incl. Pherecydes): Fowler (2000–2013) [EGM]. Herodotus: Wilson (2015). Gorgias: Buchheim (1989).
- Theocritus: Gow (1952). Theocritean scholia: Wendel (1914). Callimachus: Harder (2012) for the *Aetia*, Hollis (2009) for the *Hecale*, Pfeiffer (1949–53) for the remainder. Apollonius of Rhodes: Vian (1976–81). Apollonian scholia: Lachenaud (2010). Eratosthenes: Berger (1964) for geographical fragments. Euphorion: Lightfoot (2009). Lycophron: Hornblower (2015). Scholia on Lycophron: Leone (2002) for the *scholia vetera* [Σ], Müller (1811) for Tzetzes [Tzet.]. Nicander: Gow and Schofield (1953).
- Ennius: Skutsch (1985) for the *Annals*. Catullus: Mynors (1958). Virgil: Mynors (1969). Servius: Thilo and Hagen (1881–1902). Ovid: Alton et al. (2005) for the *Fasti*; Dörrie (1971) for the *Heroides*; Tarrant (2004) for the *Metamorphoses*. Statian scholia: Sweeney (1997).

## Works Cited

- Acosta-Hughes, B. (2010) 'The Prefigured Muse: Rethinking a Few Assumptions on Hellenistic Poets', in J.J. Clauss and M. Cuypers (eds.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World) (Oxford) 81–91
- Adkin, N. (2011) 'Sinon on his "Pal" Palamedes: (Virgil, *Aeneid* II 81–104)', *ACD* 47, 155–69
- Adrados, F.R. (1956) 'Nouveaux fragments d'Archiloque et interprétations d'Archiloque', *RPh* 30, 28–36
- (1964) 'El tema del aguila, de la epica acadia a Esquilo', *Emerita* 32, 267–82
- Agócs, P.A. (2009) 'Memory and Forgetting in Pindar's Seventh *Isthmian*', in L. Doležalová (ed.), *Strategies of Remembrance: From Pindar to Hölderlin* (Newcastle) 33–92

- (2011) 'Talking Song in Early Greek Poetry', PhD Thesis, UCL
- Alden, M.J. (2000) *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad* (Oxford)
- (2017) *Para-Narratives in the Odyssey: Stories in the Frame* (Oxford)
- Alexandrou, M. (2016a) 'Hipponax and the *Odyssey*: Subverting Text and Intertext', in A. Efstathiou and I. Karamanou (eds.), *Homeric Receptions Across Generic and Cultural Contexts* (Berlin–Boston, MA) 31–44
- (2016b) 'Mythological Narratives in Hipponax', in L. Swift and C. Carey (eds.), *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches* (Oxford) 210–28
- Allan, W. (2006) 'Divine Justice and Cosmic Order in Early Greek Epic', *JHS* 126, 1–35
- (2008a) 'Performing the Will of Zeus: The Διὸς βουλή and the Scope of Early Greek Epic', in M. Revermann and P. Wilson (eds.), *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford) 204–16
- (2008b) *Euripides: Helen* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics) (Cambridge)
- Allen, G. (2011) *Intertextuality*<sup>2</sup> (2000<sup>1</sup>, London–New York) (New Critical Idiom) (Abingdon)
- Allen, T.W. (1924) *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission* (Oxford)
- Allen, T.W., Halliday, W.R. and Sikes, E.E. (1936) *The Homeric Hymns*<sup>2</sup> (1904<sup>1</sup>) (Oxford)
- Aloni, A. (1984) 'Un Archiloco "epico" in Teocrito?', *MPhL* 6, 1–5
- Alton, E.H., Wormell, D.E.W. and Courtney, E. (eds.) (2005) *P. Ovidius Naso: Fastorum Libri Sex*<sup>4</sup> (1978<sup>1</sup>, 1985<sup>2</sup>, 1988<sup>3</sup>) (Berlin–Boston, MA)
- Álvarez, M.A.S. (2016) 'Theseus' and Pirithous' Catabasis in P.Ibscher Col.1 (Hes. fr. 280 Merkelbach–West = *Minyas* fr.7 Bernabé', in T. Derda, A. Lajtar and J. Urbanik (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology: Warsaw, 29 July – 3 August 2013* (3 vols) (Warsaw) I. 37–51
- Alwine, A.T. (2009) 'The Non-Homeric Cyclops in the Homeric *Odyssey*', *GRBS* 49, 323–33
- Andersen, Ø. (1978) *Die Diomedesgestalt in der Ilias* (SO suppl. 25) (Oslo)
- (1990) 'The Making of the Past in the *Iliad*', *HSCP* 93, 25–45
- (1998) 'Allusion and the Audience of Homer', in M. Paisi-Apostolopoulou (ed.), *Homérica. Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on the Odyssey (1–5 September 1996)* (Ithaca, Greece) 137–49
- (2012) 'Older Heroes and Earlier Poems: The Case of Heracles in the *Odyssey*', in Ø. Andersen and D.T.T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge) 138–51
- Anderson, M.J. (1997) *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art* (Oxford Classical Monographs) (Oxford)
- Année, M. (2010) 'Pouvoir du λόγος et λόγος d'un pouvoir chez Tyrtée', in E. Bona and M. Curnis (eds.), *Linguaggi del Potere, Poteri del Linguaggio. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale del P.A.R.S.A. (Torino, 6–8– Novembre 2008)* (Culture Antiche. Studi e Testi 23) (Alessandria) 79–85
- Armstrong, R. (2006) *Cretan Women: Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin Poetry* (Oxford Classical Monographs) (Oxford)
- Arrighetti, G. (1998) *Esiòdo, Opere: testi introdotti, tradotti e commentati* (Biblioteca della Pléiade 27) (Turin)
- Athanassaki, L. (2012) 'Performance and re-performance: The Siphnian Treasury evoked (Pindar's *Pythian* 6, *Olympian* 2 and *Isthmian* 2)', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge) 134–57
- Atkin, A. (2005) 'Peirce on the Index and Indexical Reference', *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 41, 161–88
- Austin, C. and Olson, S.D. (2004) *Aristophanes: Thesmophoriazusae* (Oxford)
- Babut, D. (1975) 'Simonide moraliste', *REG* 88, 20–62
- Bachvarova, M.R. (2016) *From Hittite to Homer: The Anatolian Background of Ancient Greek Epic* (Cambridge)
- Bakker, E.J. (2002) 'Remembering the God's Arrival', *Arethusa* 35, 63–81

- (2008) 'Epic Remembering', in E.A. Mackay (ed.), *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 7) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 298) (Leiden–Boston, MA) 65–77
- (2013) *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey* (Cambridge–New York, NY)
- (2017) 'Hector (and) the race horse: The telescopic vision of the *Iliad*', in C.C. Tsagalis and A. Markantonatos (eds.), *The Winnowing Oar – New Perspectives in Homeric Studies* (Berlin–Boston, MA) 57–74
- Bakola, E. (2010) *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy* (Cambridge)
- Baldi, A. (1961) 'Tracce del Mito di Etana in Archiloco ed Esopo', *Aevum(ant)* 35, 381–84
- Bannert, H. (1988) *Formen des Wiederholens bei Homer: Beispiele für eine Poetik des Epos* (WS Beiheft 13) (Vienna)
- Bär, S. (2009) *Quintus Smyrnaeus Posthomeric 1: die Wiedergeburt des Epos aus dem Geiste der Amazonomachie: mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1–219* (*Hypomnemata* 183) (Göttingen)
- Barchiesi, A. (1993) 'Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*', *HSCP* 95, 333–65 [repr. in Barchiesi (2001) 105–127]
- (1995) 'Figure dell'intertestualità nell'epica romana', *Lexis* 13, 49–67 [tr. as Barchiesi (2001) 129–40]
- (2001) *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets* (London)
- Barker, E.T.E. (2009) *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy* (Oxford)
- Barker, E.T.E. and Christensen, J.P. (2006) 'Flight Club: The New Archilochus Fragment and Its Resonance with Homeric Epic', *MD* 57, 9–41
- (2008) 'Oedipus of Many Pains: Strategies of Contest in the Homeric Poems', *LICS* 7.2, 1–30
- (2011) 'On not remembering Tydeus: Diomedes and the contest for Thebes', *MD* 66, 9–44
- (2014) 'Even Herakles Had to Die: Homeric "Heroism", Mortality and the Epic Tradition', in C.C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Theban Resonances in Homeric Epic*. *TC* 6.2, 249–277
- Barner, W. (1967) *Neuere Alkaios-Papyri aus Oxyrhynchus* (*Spudasmata* 14) (Hildesheim)
- Barnes, T.G. (2011) 'Homeric ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην', *JHS* 131, 1–13
- Barrett, W.S. (2007a) 'Stesichoros and the Story of Geryon', in *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism: Collected Papers* (ed. M.L. West) (Oxford) 1–24 [previously unpublished paper delivered at the Hellenic and Roman Societies' Triennial Meeting at Oxford in September 1968]
- (2007b) 'Two Studies in Pindaric Metre', in *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism: Collected Papers* (ed. M.L. West) (Oxford) 118–206
- Barringer, J.M. (1996) 'Atalanta as Model: The Hunter and the Hunted', *ClAnt* 15, 48–76
- Barron, J.P. (1969) 'Ibycus: *To Polycrates*', *BICS* 16, 119–49
- Baumbach, M. (2012) 'Borderline Experience with Genre: The Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* between Epic, Hymn and Epyllic Poetry', in M. Baumbach and S. Bär (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and its Reception* (*Brill's Companions in Classical Studies*) (Leiden) 135–48
- Beck, D. (2005) 'Odysseus: Narrator, Storyteller, Poet?', *CP* 100, 213–27
- Beecroft, A.J. (2006) '"This Is Not a True Story": Stesichorus's *Palinode* and the Revenge of the Epichoric', *TAPA* 136, 47–69.
- (2010) *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China: Patterns of Literary Circulation* (Cambridge)
- Benardete, S. (1963) 'Some Misquotations of Homer in Plato', *Phronesis* 8, 173–78
- Berger, E.H. (ed.) (1964) *Die geographischen Fragmente des Eratosthenes* (Amsterdam)
- Bergren, A.L.T. (1981) 'Helen's "Good Drug"', in S. Kresic (ed.), *Contemporary Literary Hermeneutics and Interpretation of Classical Texts* (Ottawa) 200–214 [repr. in Bergren (2008) 111–30; Doherty (ed.) (2009) 314–35]

- (2008) *Weaving Truth: Essays on Language and the Female in Greek Thought* (Hellenic Studies 19) (Cambridge, MA–London)
- Berman, D.W. (2015) *Myth, Literature and the Creation of the Topography of Thebes* (Cambridge)
- Bernabé, A. (ed.) (1987–2007) *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum. Testimonia et Fragmenta* (4 vols). Pars I (1987<sup>1</sup>, Leipzig; 1996<sup>2</sup>, Stuttgart–Leipzig). Pars II, Fasc. 1 & 2: *Orphicorum et Orphicis Similium Testimonia et Fragmenta* (2004, 2005, Munich–Leipzig). Pars II, Fasc. 3: *Musaeus, Linus, Epimenides, Papyrus Derveni, Indices* (2007, Berlin–New York, NY)
- Bernsdorff, H. (2014) 'Notes on P.Mich. inv. 3498 + 3250b recto, 3250a and 3250c recto (list of lyric and tragic incipits)', *APF* 60, 3–11
- Bershadsky, N. (2011) 'A Picnic, a Tomb, and a Crow: Hesiod's Cult in the *Works and Days*', *HSCP* 106, 1–45
- Bethe, E. (1966) *Der Troische Epenkreis* (1929<sup>1</sup>) (Stuttgart)
- Bettarini, L. (2007) 'Note esegetiche alla nuova Saffo: I versi di Titono (fr. 58, 19–22 V.)', *ZPE* 159, 1–10
- Bing, P. (1990) 'A Pun on Aratus' Name in Verse 2 of the *Phainomena*?', *HSCP* 93, 281–85
- (2009) 'Allusion from the Broad, Well-Trodden Street: The *Odyssey* in Inscribed and Literary Epigram', in *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry* (Ann Arbor, MI) 147–74
- (2012) 'A Proto-Epyllion? The Pseudo-Hesiodic Shield and the Poetics of Deferral', in M. Baumbach and S. Bär (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and its Reception* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies) (Leiden) 177–97
- Biondi, F. (2015) *Teagene di Reggio rapsodo e interprete di Omero* (Synthesis: Biblioteca di studi e ricerche sull'antichità classica 2) (Pisa–Rome)
- Blondell, R. (2010) 'Refractions of Homer's Helen in Archaic Lyric', *AJP* 131, 349–91
- Blümer, W. (2001) *Interpretation Archaischer Dichtung: Die Mythologischen Partien der Erga Hesiods* (2 vols). Vol. 1: *Die Voraussetzungen: Autoren, Texte und Homerische Fragen*. Vol. 2: *Wahrheit und Dichtung: Die Verse 1–105. Bibliographie* (Münster)
- Bölte, F. (1934) 'Ein Pylisches Epos', *RhM* 83, 319–47
- Borges, C. and Sampson, C.M. (eds.) (2012) *New Literary Papyri from the Michigan Collection: Mythographic Lyric and a Catalogue of Poetic First Lines* (New Texts from Ancient Cultures) (Ann Arbor, MI)
- Borthwick, E.K. (1985) *Odyssean Elements in the Iliad* (Inaugural lecture) (Edinburgh)
- Bossi, F. (1973/74) 'Note al Nuovo Archiloco', *MCr* 8–9, 14–17
- von Bothmer, D. (1957) *Amazons in Greek Art* (Oxford)
- Bouvier, D. (1997) '«Mneme». Le peripezie della memoria greca', in S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci: Storia Cultura Arte Società. 2 Una storia greca. II Definizione* (Turin) 1131–46
- (2002) *Le Sceptre et la Lyre. L'Iliade ou les Héros de la Mémoire*. (Collection Horos) (Grenoble)
- Bowie, A.M. (2013) *Homer: Odyssey Books XIII and XIV* (Cambridge)
- Bowie, E.L. (1986) 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106, 13–35
- (2001) 'Ancestors of Historiography in Early Greek Elegy and Iambic Poetry?', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford) 45–66
- (2008) 'Sex and Politics in Archilochos' Poetry', in D. Katsonopoulou, I. Petropoulos and S. Katsarou (eds.), *Archilochus and his Age. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades* (Athens) 133–43
- (2010a) 'The Trojan War's Reception in Early Greek Lyric, Iambic and Elegiac Poetry', in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke and N. Luraghi (eds.), *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart) 57–87
- (2010b) 'Historical Narrative in Archaic and Early Classical Greek Elegy', in D. Konstan and K.A. Raafaub (eds.), *Epic and History* (Ancient World–Comparative Histories) (Oxford) 145–66

- (2016) 'Cultic Contexts for Elegiac Performance', in L. Swift and C. Carey (eds.), *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches* (Oxford) 15–32
- Bowra, C.M. (1930) *Tradition and Design in the Iliad* (Oxford)
- (1938) 'The Daughters of Asopus', *Hermes* 73, 213–21 [repr. in Bowra (1953) 54–65]
- (1952) *Heroic Poetry* (London)
- (1953) *Problems in Greek Poetry* (Oxford)
- (1963) 'The Two Palinodes of Stesichorus', *CR* 13, 245–52
- (1964) *Pindar* (Oxford)
- Braswell, B.K. (1971) 'Mythological Innovation in the *Iliad*', *CQ* 21, 16–26
- (1988) *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Texte und Kommentare 14) (Berlin)
- (1992) *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One* (Fribourg)
- (1998) *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Texte und Kommentare 19) (Berlin)
- Brewster, H. (1997) *The River Gods of Greece: Myths and Mountain Waters in the Hellenic World* (London)
- Brillet-Dubois, P. (2011) 'An Erotic *Aristeia*: The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite and its Relation to the Iliadic Tradition', in A. Faulkner (ed.), *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays* (Oxford) 105–32
- Broich, U. (1985) 'Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität', in U. Broich and M. Pfister (eds.), *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, Anglistische Fallstudien* (Tübingen) 31–47
- Brommer, F. (1973) *Vasenlisten zur Griechischen Heldensage*<sup>3</sup> (1956<sup>1</sup>, 1960<sup>2</sup>) (Marburg)
- Brown, C.G. (2011) 'To the Ends of the Earth: Sappho on Tithonus', *ZPE* 178, 21–25
- (2014) 'Vipers and Lost Youth: A Note on Old Age in Early Greek Epic', *CQ* 64, 825–28
- (2018) 'Picturing a Truth: Beast Fable, Early *Iambos*, and Semonides on the Creation of Women', in W. Allan and L.A. Swift (eds.), *Moralizing Strategies in Early Greek Poetry*. *Mouseion* III 15.1, 29–47
- Brunori, S. (2011) 'Aiace, Achille e le armi tra epica arcaica e iconografia vascolare', in A. Aloni and M. Ornaghi (eds.), *Tra Panellenismo e Tradizioni Locali: Nuovi Contributi* (Orione 4) (Messina) 53–80
- Buchheim, T. (ed.) (1989) *Gorgias von Leontinoi: Reden, Fragmente und Testimonien* (Philosophische Bibliothek 404) (Hamburg)
- Buchner, G. and Russo, C.F. (1955) 'La Coppa Di Nestore e un'inscrizione metrica da Pitecusa dell'VIII Secolo Av. Cr.', *RAL* 10, 215–34
- Budelmann, F. (2009) 'Introducing Greek Lyric', in F. Budelmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge) 1–18
- (2017) 'Performance, Reperformance, Preperformance: The Paradox of Repeating the Unique in Pindaric Epinician and Beyond', in R.L. Hunter and A.S. Uhlig (eds.), *Imagining Reperformance in Ancient Culture: Studies in the Traditions of Drama and Lyric* (Cambridge Classical Studies) (Cambridge–New York, NY) 42–62
- (2018) *Greek Lyric: A Selection* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics) (Cambridge)
- Budelmann, F. and Phillips, T. (2018) 'Introduction: Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece', in F. Budelmann and T. Phillips (eds.), *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece* (Oxford) 1–27
- Burgess, J.S. (1995) 'Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth', *ClAnt* 14, 217–44
- (1996) 'The Non-Homeric *Cypria*', *TAPA* 126, 77–99
- (2001a) *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore, MD)
- (2001b) 'Coronis Aflame: The Gender of Mortality', *CP* 96, 214–27
- (2006) 'Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference', *Oral Tradition* 21, 148–89
- (2009) *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles* (Baltimore, MD)
- (2012) 'Intertextuality without Text in Early Greek Epic', in Ø. Andersen and D.T.T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge) 168–83

- (2015) *Homer* (London–New York, NY)
- (2017) 'The Tale of Meleager in the *Iliad*', *Oral Tradition* 31, 51–76
- Burkert, W. (1960) 'Das Lied von Ares und Aphrodite: Zum Verhältnis von Odyssee und Ilias', *RhM* 103, 130–44 [repr. in Burkert (2001) 105–16; tr. as Burkert (1997)]
- (1976) 'Das hunderttorige Theben und die Datierung der Ilias', *WS* 89, 5–21 [repr. in Burkert (2001) 59–71]
- (1979) *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Sather Classical Lectures 47) (Berkeley, CA–London)
- (1984) *Die Orientalisierende Epoche in der Griechischen Religion und Literatur* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 1) (Heidelberg)
- (1987) 'The Making of Homer in the Sixth Century B.C.: Rhapsodes versus Stesichoros', in *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World* (Malibu, CA) 43–62 [repr. in Burkert (2001) 198–217; Cairns (2001b) 92–116]
- (1992) *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* [tr. of Burkert (1984) by M.E. Pinder and W. Burkert] (Revealing Antiquity 5) (Cambridge, MA–London)
- (1997) 'The Song of Ares and Aphrodite: On the Relationship between the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*', in *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation* (Oxford) 249–62 [tr. of Burkert (1960) by P.V. Jones and G.M. Wright; repr. in Doherty (ed.) (2009) 29–43]
- (2001) *Kleine Schriften I: Homérica* (ed. C. Riedweg) (Göttingen)
- Burnett, A.P. (1979) 'Desire and Memory (Sappho Frag. 94)', *CP* 74, 16–27
- (1983) *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (London)
- (1985) *The Art of Bacchylides* (Cambridge, MA–London)
- (2005) *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina* (Oxford)
- Burris, S., Fish, J. and Obbink, D. (2014) 'New Fragments of Book 1 of Sappho', *ZPE* 189, 1–28
- Bury, J.B. (1890) *Pindar: The Nemean Odes, edited with Introductions and Commentary* (London–New York, NY)
- Cairns, D.L. (2001a) 'Introduction', in D.L. Cairns (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford) 1–56
- (ed.) (2001b) *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford)
- (2010) *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes* (3, 5, 9, 11, 13). *Text, Introductory Essays, and Interpretative Commentary* (Cambridge)
- Cairns, F. (1997) 'Ancient "etymology" and Tibullus: on the classification of "etymologies" and on "etymological markers"', *CCJ* 42, 24–59
- (2011) 'Money and the Poet: The First Stasimon of Pindar *Isthmian* 2', *Mnemosyne* 64, 21–36
- Calame, C. (2011) 'The Homeric Hymns as Poetic Offerings. Musical and Ritual Relationships with the Gods', in A. Faulkner (ed.), *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays* (Oxford) 334–57
- (2012) 'La memoria poetica nei canti di Saffo: performance musicale e creazione sociale', in X. Riu and J. Pòrtulas (eds.), *Approaches to Archaic Greek Poetry* (Orione 5) (Messina) 45–97
- Cameron, A. (2004) *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (American Classical Studies 48) (New York, NY–Oxford)
- Campbell, D.A. (1982) *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry* (1967<sup>1</sup>: London) (Bristol)
- Campbell, M. (1981) *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 72) (Leiden)
- Canevaro, L.G. (2015) *Hesiod's Works and Days: How to Teach Self-Sufficiency* (Oxford)
- Cannatà Fera, M. (1986) 'Pindaro interprete di Omero in *Pyth.* 3, 81–2', *GIF* 38, 85–89
- Cantieni, R. (1942) 'Die Nestorerzählung im XI. Gesang der Ilias (V 670–762)', PhD Thesis, University of Zurich

- Cardin, M. (2010) 'L'ehoia di Egina e le Asopidi nel *Catalogo delle donne esiodeo*', in E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra Panellenismo e Tradizioni Locali: Generi Poetici e Storiografia* (Hellenica 34) (Alessandria) 151–210
- Carey, C. (2008) 'Hipponax Narrator', *Acta Ant. Hung.* 48, 89–102
- (2018) 'Narrative, Authority, and Blame', in W. Allan and L.A. Swift (eds.), *Moralizing Strategies in Early Greek Poetry*. *Mouseion* III 15.1, 7–27
- Carnes, J.S. (1990) 'The Aiginetan Genesis of the Myrmidons: A Note on *Nemean* 3.13–16', *CW* 84, 41–44
- Carpino, A.A. (1996) 'The delivery of Helen's egg: an examination of an Etruscan relief mirror', *EtrStud* 3, 33–44
- Carrara, L. (2011) '"The very worst that could have been chosen": la funzione dell'*exemplum* di Titono nell'*Inno omerico ad Afrodite*', in A. Aloni and M. Ornaghi (eds.), *Tra Panellenismo e Tradizioni Locali: Nuovi Contributi* (Orione 4) (Messina) 81–115
- Carruesco, J. (2017) 'The Invention of Stesichorus: Hesiod, Helen, and the Muse', in E.J. Bakker (ed.), *Authorship and Greek Song: Authority, Authenticity, and Performance* (Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, Vol. 3) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 402) (Leiden–Boston, MA) 178–96
- Cassio, A.C. (1994) 'Κείνος, καλλιστέφανος, e la circolazione dell'epica in area euboica', in B. d'Agostino and D. Ridgway (eds.), *Ἀποικία: Scritti in Onore di G. Buchner*, *AION(archeol)* 1, 55–67
- Castagnoli, L. and Ceccarelli, P. (eds.) (forthcoming) *Greek Memories: Theories and Practices* (Cambridge)
- Catenacci, C. and Di Marzio, M. (2004) 'Il gallo di Urania (Bacchilide, *Epinicio* 4)', *QUCC* 76, 71–89
- Cazzato, V. (2015) 'Hipponax' Poetic Initiation and Herodas' "Dream"', *CCJ* 61, 1–14
- Chapouthier, F. (1942) 'Léda devant l'oeuf de Némésis', *BCH* 66, 1–21
- Chaudhuri, P. (2014) *The War with God: Theomachy in Roman Imperial Poetry* (New York, NY–Oxford)
- Christensen, J.P. (2012) 'Ares ἄδηνλος: On the Text of *Iliad* 5.757 and 5.872', *CP* 107, 230–38
- (2015a) 'Diomedes' Foot-wound and the Homeric Reception of Myth', in J.M. González (ed.), *Diachrony: Diachronic Studies of Ancient Greek Literature and Culture* (Mythos Eikon Poiesis 7) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 17–42
- (2015b) 'Time and Self-Referentiality in the *Iliad* and Frank Herbert's *Dune*', in B.M. Rogers and B.E. Stevens (eds.), *Classical Traditions in Science Fiction* (Oxford–New York, NY) 161–75
- Christopoulos, M. (2014) 'Odysseus, Diomedes, Dolon and Palamedes: Crimes of Mystery and Imagination', in M. Christopoulos and M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou (eds.), *Crime and Punishment in Homeric and Archaic Epic: Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium on the Odyssey, Ithaca, September 3–7, 2013* (Ithaca, Greece) 153–66
- Cingano, E. (1990) 'Lo strano ingresso di Aiace nel *Catalogo delle donne esiodeo*', *Teiresias* Suppl. 3, 111–17
- (1991) 'La data e l'occasione dell'encomio bacchilideo per Ierone (Bacchyl. fr. 20 C Sn. –M.)', *QUCC* 38, 31–34
- (2005) 'A Catalogue within a Catalogue: Helen's Suitors in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 196–204)', in R.L. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge) 118–52
- (2009) 'The Hesiodic Corpus', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod* (Leiden) 91–130
- (2015) 'Epigonoí', in M. Fantuzzi and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge) 244–60
- Civil, M. (2003) 'Reading Gilgameš II: Gilgameš and Huwawa', in W. Sallaberger, K. Volk and A. Zgoll (eds.), *Literatur, Politik und Recht in Mesopotamien: Festschrift für Claus Wilcke* (Orientalia Biblica et Christiana 14) (Wiesbaden) 77–87
- Clark, M.E. (1986) 'Neoanalysis: A Bibliographical Review', *CW* 79, 379–94

- Clarke, M.J., Currie, B.G.F. and Lyne, R.O.A.M. (eds.) (2006) *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford)
- Clay, J.S. (1997) *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*<sup>2</sup> (1983<sup>1</sup>: Princeton, NJ) (Lanham, MD)
- (2003) *Hesiod's Cosmos* (Cambridge)
- (2011a) *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the Iliad* (Cambridge)
- (2011b) 'Olympians 1–3: A Song Cycle?', in L. Athanassaki and E.L. Bowie (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination* (TC Suppl. 10) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 337–46
- Clayman, D. (1993) 'Corinna and Pindar', in R.M. Rosen and J. Farrell (eds.), *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Ann Arbor, MI) 633–42
- (2009) *Timon of Phlius: Pyrrhonism into Poetry* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 98) (Berlin)
- Clayton, J. and Rothstein, E. (1991) 'Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality', in J. Clayton and E. Rothstein (eds.), *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Madison, WI) 3–36
- Clément-Tarantino, S. (2006a) 'Fama ou la renommée du genre. Recherches sur la représentation de la tradition dans l'Énéide', PhD Thesis, Lille
- (2006b) 'La poétique romaine comme hybridation féconde. Les leçons de la greffe (Virgile, Géorgiques, 2, 9–82)', *Interférences – Ars Scribendi* 4, 1–26
- Clerc, A. (2007) 'Loca: lieux d'intertextualité et de réflexivité dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide. Étude d'un marqueur lexical de l'allusion', Master's Thesis, Université Charles-de-Gaulle-Lille3
- Clua, J.A. (1985) 'El mite de Palamedes a la Grècia antiga: aspectes canviants d'un interrogant cultural i històric', *Faventia* VII, 69–93
- Cohen, Y. (2013) *Wisdom from the Late Bronze Age* (Atlanta, GA)
- Cole, S. (2008) 'Annotated Innovation in Euripides' *Ion*', *CQ* 58, 313–15
- Cole, T. (2003) 'Pindar's Two Odes for Melissos of Thebes', in F. Benedetti and S. Grandolini (eds.), *Studi di Filologia e Tradizione Greca in Memoria di Aristide Colonna* (Studi e ricerche di filologia classica, 2 vols) (Naples) I. 241–52
- Collins, D. (2004) *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry* (Hellenic Studies 7) (Washington, D.C.)
- (2006) 'Corinna and Mythological Innovation', *CQ* 56, 19–32
- Condilo, C. (2017) 'Agonistic Intertextuality: Herodotus' engagement with Hecataeus on genealogies', *JAH* 5, 228–279
- Conte, G.B. (1985) *Memoria dei Poeti e Sistema Letterario: Catullo, Virgilio, Ovidio, Lucano* (Turin)
- (1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* [tr. of Conte (1985) by C. Segal] (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 44) (Ithaca, NY)
- (2017) *Stealing the Club from Hercules. On Imitation in Latin Poetry* (Berlin–Boston, MA)
- Cook, E.F. (2000) 'Review of Malkin (1998)', *BMCR* 2000.03.22,
- (2009) 'OMHPON ΕΕ OMHPOΥ: Review of Kelly (2007)', *CR* 59, 14–16
- Corrêa, P. da C. (2007) 'A Human Fable and the Justice of Beasts in Archilochus', in P.F. Finglass, C. Collard and N.J. Richardson (eds.), *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford) 101–17
- Cowan, R. (2017) 'Ovid, Virgil and the Echoing Rocks of the Two Scyllas', *CCJ* 63, 11–28
- Coward, T.R.P. (2013) 'Review of Curtis (2011)', *JHS* 133, 163–65
- Crissy, K. (1997) 'Herakles, Odysseus, and the Bow: *Odyssey* 21.11–41', *CJ* 93, 41–53
- Cristóbal, A.J.S. (2009) 'The Meaning of βάκχος and βακχεύειν in Orphism', in G. Casadio and P.A. Johnston (eds.), *Mystic Cults in Magna Graecia* (Austin, TX) 46–60
- Crusius, O. (1889) 'Der homerische Dionysos hymnus und die Legende von der Verwandlung der Tyrsener', *Philologus* 48, 193–228



- Curley, D. (2013) *Tragedy in Ovid: Theater, Metatheater, and the Transformation of a Genre* (Cambridge–New York, NY)
- Currie, B.G.F. (2005) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford Classical Monographs) (Oxford)
- (2006) 'Homer and the Early Epic Tradition', in M.J. Clarke, B.G.F. Currie and R.O.A.M. Lyne (eds.), *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford) 1–45
- (2012) 'The *Iliad*, *Gilgamesh*, and Neoanalysis', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (TC Suppl. 12) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 543–80
- (2015) 'Cypria', in M. Fantuzzi and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge) 281–305
- (2016) *Homer's Allusive Art* (Oxford)
- (forthcoming) 'Etana in Greece', in A. Kelly and C. Metcalf (eds.), *Divine Narratives in Greece and the Near East* (Oxford)
- Curtis, P. (2011) *Stesichoros's Geryoneis* (Leiden)
- Dale, A. (2015) 'The Green Papyrus of Sappho (P.GC Inv. 105) and the Order of Poems in the Alexandrian Edition', *ZPE* 196, 17–30
- D'Alessio, G.B. (2004) 'Past Future and Present Past: Temporal Deixis in Greek Archaic Lyric', *Arethusa* 37, 267–94
- (2005a) 'The *Megalai Ehoiai*: A Survey of the Fragments', in R.L. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge) 176–216
- (2005b) 'Ordered from the Catalogue: Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic Genealogical Poetry', in R.L. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge) 217–38
- Dalley, S. and Reyes, A.T. (1998) 'Mesopotamian Contact and Influence in the Greek World: 1. To the Persian Conquest', in S. Dalley (ed.), *The Legacy of Mesopotamia* (Oxford) 85–106
- Danek, G. (1994/95) 'Der Nestorbecher von Ischia, epische Zitiertechnik und das Symposion', *WS* 107–108, 29–44
- (1998) *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee* (WS Beiheft 22) (Vienna)
- (2002) 'Traditional Referentiality and Homeric Intertextuality', in F. Montanari and P. Ascheri (eds.), *Omero Tremila Anni Dopo* (Storia e letteratura 210) (Rome) 3–19
- (2005) 'Antenor und die Bittgesandtschaft: Ilias, Bakchylides 15 und der Astarita-Krater', *WS* 118, 1–17
- (2006) 'Antenor und seine Familie in der Ilias', *WS* 119, 5–22
- (2010) 'Agamemnon's Ancestors and Ruža's Bridegroom: *Il.* 2.99–109 and a Bosnian Parallel', in C.C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Homeric Hypertextuality. TC 2.2*, 225–238
- (2016) 'Modes of Intertextuality in Homer and Bosnian Epic', in F. Gallo (ed.), *Omero: Quaestiones Disputatae* (Ambrosiana Graecolatina 5) (Milan–Rome) 123–45
- D'Arms, E.F. and Hulley, K.K. (1946) 'The Oresteia-story in the *Odyssey*', *TAPA* 77, 207–13
- Davies, M. (1986a) 'Prolegomena and Paralegomena to a New Edition (with Commentary) of the Fragments of Early Greek Epic', *Nachr. Akad. Wissensch. Göttingen (Phil.-hist. Kl.)* 2, 91–111
- (1986b) 'The Motif of the  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\epsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$  in Alcman', *ZPE* 65, 25–27
- (1986c) 'Alcaeus, Thetis and Helen', *Hermes* 114, 257–62
- (ed.) (1988) *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. 1: *Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus* (Oxford)
- (1989) *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol)
- (2014) *The Theban Epics* (Hellenic Studies 69) (Cambridge, MA)
- (2016) *The Aethiopis: Neo-Neoanalysis Reanalyzed* (Hellenic Studies 71) (Cambridge, MA)

- Davies, M. and Finglass, P. (eds.) (2014) *Stesichorus: The Poems* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 54) (Cambridge)
- Davison, J.A. (1938) 'Alcman's Partheneion', *Hermes* 73, 440–58 [repr. in Davison (1968) 146–72]
- (1955) 'Quotations and Allusions in Early Greek Literature', *Eranos* 53, 125–40 [repr. in Davison (1968) 70–85]
- (1968) *From Archilochus to Pindar. Papers on Greek Literature of the Archaic Period* (London)
- Debiasi, A. (2008) *Esiodo e l'Occidente* (Hesperia, Studi sulla Grecità di Occidente 24) (Rome)
- DeBrohun, J.B. (2007) 'Catullan Intertextuality: Apollonius and the Allusive Plot of Catullus 64', in M.B. Skinner (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Catullus* (Oxford) 293–313
- Degani, E. (1984) *Studi su Ipponatte* (Studi e commenti 2) (Bari)
- Dell'Oro, F. (2013) 'Après l'inscription de la coupe de Nestor: disposition du texte et formes de transtextualité dans les épigrammes de l'époque archaïque en Grande Grèce et Sicile', *Gaia* 16, 307–32
- Denniston, J.D. (1954) *The Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> (1934<sup>1</sup>) (Oxford)
- Detienne, M. (1967) *Les Maîtres de Vérité dans la Grèce Archaïque* [tr. as Detienne (1996)] (Textes à l'appui) (Paris)
- (1977) *Dionysos Mis à Mort* [tr. as Detienne (1979)] (Paris)
- (1979) *Dionysos Slain* [tr. of Detienne (1977) by M. Muellner and L. Muellner] (Baltimore, MD–London)
- (1996) *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece* [tr. of Detienne (1967) by J. Lloyd] (New York, NY)
- Di Benedetto, V. (1994) *Nel Laboratorio di Omero*<sup>1</sup> (1998<sup>2</sup>) (Turin)
- (2001) 'Reuses of Iliadic Patterns in the *Odyssey*', *RCCM* 43, 7–14
- Di Gregorio, L. (ed.) (1975) *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Theogoniam* (Scienze filologiche e letteratura 6) (Milan)
- Dickson, K.M. (1992) 'Kalkhas and Nestor: Two Narrative Strategies in *Iliad* 1', *Arethusa* 25, 327–58
- (1995) *Nestor: Poetic Memory in Greek Epic* (Albert Bates Lord Studies in Oral Tradition 16) (New York, NY–London)
- Diggle, J. (ed.) (1981–94) *Euripidis Fabulae* (3 vols). Vol. 1: *Cyclops, Alcestis, Medea, Heraclidae, Hippolytus, Andromacha, Hecuba* (1984). Vol. 2: *Supplices, Electra, Hercules, Troades, Iphigenia in Tauris, Ion* (1981). Vol. 3: *Helena, Phoenissae, Orestes, Bacchae, Iphigenia Aulidensis, Rhesus* (1994) (Oxford)
- Dihle, A. (1968) *Der Kanon der Zwei Tugenden* (Geisteswissenschaften, Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen 144) (Cologne–Opladen)
- (1969) 'Die Inschrift vom Nestor-Becher aus Ischia', *Hermes* 97, 257–61
- van Dijk, G.-J. (1997) *Αἶνοι, Λόγοι, Μῦθοι: Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature. With a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 166) (Leiden–New York, NY–Cologne)
- Dindorf, W. (ed.) (1855) *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam* (2 vols). Vol. 1:  $\alpha - \theta$ . Vol. 2:  $\iota - \omega$ . (Oxford)
- Dodds, E.R. (1960) *Euripides: Bacchae* (Oxford)
- Doherty, L.E. (ed.) (2009) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford)
- Dörrie, H. (ed.) (1971) *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum* (Texte und Kommentare 6) (Berlin)
- Dover, K.J. (1993) *Aristophanes: Frogs* (Oxford)
- Dowden, K. (1996) 'Homer's Sense of Text', *JHS* 116, 47–61
- Drachmann, A.B. (ed.) (1997) *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina* (3 vols). Vol. 1: *Scholia in Olympionicas* (1903<sup>1</sup>). Vol. 2: *Scholia in Pythionicas* (1910<sup>1</sup>). Vol. 3: *Scholia in Nemeonicas et Isthmionicas, Epimetrum, Indices* (1927<sup>1</sup>) (Stuttgart–Leipzig)
- Dräger, P. (ed.) (2011) *Apollodor: Bibliothek. Götter- und Heldensagen* (Sammlung Tusculum) (Berlin)
- Duckworth, G.E. (1933) 'Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil', PhD Thesis, Princeton University

- Du  , C. (2002) *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis* (Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches) (Lanham, MD–Oxford)
- Dunkle, R. (1997) ‘Swift-Footed Achilles’, *CW* 90, 227–34
- Durante, M. (1971) *Sulla Preistoria della Tradizione Poetica Greca*. Pt. 1: *Continuit   della Tradizione Poetica dall’Et   Micenea ai Primi Documenti* (Incunabula Graeca 50) (Rome)
- Easterling, P.E. (1982) *Sophocles: Trachiniae* (Cambridge)
- (1993) ‘Gods on Stage in Greek Tragedy’, in J. Dalfen, G. Petersmann and F.F. Schwarz (eds.), *Religio Graeco-Romana: Festschrift f  r Walter P  tscher. Grazer Beitr  ge Suppl. 5* (Horn) 77–86
- Ebbott, M. (2014) ‘Allies in Fame: Recruiting Warriors in the Theban and Trojan Epic Traditions’, in C.C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Theban Resonances in Homeric Epic*. *TC* 6.2, 319–335
- Edmunds, L. (1985) ‘The Genre of Theognidean Poetry’, in T.J. Figueira and G. Nagy (eds.), *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis* (Baltimore, MD–London) 96–111
- (2001) *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry* (Baltimore, MD–London)
- (2006) ‘The New Sappho:   φαντο (9)’, *ZPE* 156, 23–26
- (2016) ‘Intertextuality without Texts in Archaic Greek Verse and the Plan of Zeus’, *SyllClass* 27, 1–27
- Edsman, C.-M. (1949) *Ignis Divinus: Le Feu comme Moyen de Rajeunissement et d’Immortalit  : Contes, L  gendes, Mythes et Rites* (Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-societeten i Lund 34) (Lund)
- Edwards, A.T. (1985a) *Achilles in the Odyssey: Ideologies of Heroism in the Homeric Epic* (Beitr  ge zur klassischen Philologie 171) (K  nigstein/Ts.)
- (1985b) ‘Achilles in the Underworld: *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Aethiopis*’, *GRBS* 26, 215–28
- Edwards, G.P. (1971) *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Publications of the Philological Society 22) (Oxford)
- Edwards, M.W. (1987) *Homer: Poet of the Iliad* (Baltimore, MD–London)
- (1991) *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 5: *Books 17–20* (Cambridge)
- Edzard, D.O. (1990) ‘Gilgamesh und Huwawa A. I. Teil’, *ZA* 80, 165–203
- (1991) ‘Gilgamesh und Huwawa A. II. Teil’, *ZA* 81, 165–233
- Elmer, D.F. (2005) ‘Helen Epigrammatopoios’, *ClAnt* 24, 1–39
- (2013) *The Poetics of Consent* (Baltimore, MD)
- Else, G.F. (1957) *Aristotle’s Poetics: The Argument* (Cambridge, MA)
- Erbse, H. (ed.) (1969–88) *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia vetera)* (7 vols). Vol. 1: *Praefatio, A–  * (1969). Vol. 2: *E–I* (1971). Vol. 3: *K–  * (1974). Vol. 4: *O–T* (1975). Vol. 5: *Y–  * (1977). Vol. 6: *Indices I–IV* (1983). Vol. 7: *Index V, addenda et corrigenda* (1988) (Berlin)
- Erskine, A. (2001) *Troy Between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power* (Oxford)
- Fabbro, H. (1995) *Carmina Convivalia Attica* (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 11) (Rome)
- Faber, R.A. (2017) ‘The Hellenistic Origins of Memory as Trope for Literary Allusion in Latin Poetry’, *Philologus* 161, 77–89
- Fantuzzi, M. (2004) ‘The Magic of (Some) Allusions: Philodemus *AP* 5.107 (*GPh* 3188ff.; 23 Sider)’, *HSCP* 102, 213–236
- (2012) *Achilles in Love: Intertextual Studies* (Oxford)
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R.L. (2004) *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge)
- Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C.C. (eds.) (2015) *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge)
- Faraone, C.A. (1996) ‘Taking the “Nestor’s Cup Inscription” Seriously: Erotic Magic and Conditional Curses in the Earliest Inscribed Hexameters’, *ClAnt* 15, 77–112
- Farmer, M.C. (2017) *Tragedy on the Comic Stage* (New York, NY)
- Farnell, L.R. (1932) *The Works of Pindar. Translated with Literary and Critical Commentaries*. Vol. 2: *Critical Commentary* (London)

- Farrell, J. (2005) 'Intention and Intertext', *Phoenix* 59, 98–111
- Faulkner, A. (2008) *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite. Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Oxford)
- Fearn, D. (2003) 'Mapping Phleious: Politics and Myth-Making in Bacchylides 9', *CQ* 53, 347–67
- (2007) *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition* (Oxford Classical Monographs) (Oxford)
- (2018) 'Materialities of Political Commitment? Textual Events, Material Culture, and Metaliterarity in Alcaeus', in F. Budelmann and T. Phillips (eds.), *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece* (Oxford) 93–113
- Fedeli, P. (2005) *Properzio: Elegie Libro II: Introduzione, Testo e Commento* (Cambridge)
- Feeney, D.C. (1991) *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford)
- Feeney, D.C. and Nelis, D. (2005) 'Two Virgilian Acrostics: *Certissima Signa?*', *CQ* 55, 644–46
- Fehling, D. (1971) *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot: Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots* [tr. as Fehling (1989)] (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 9) (Berlin–New York, NY)
- (1989) *Herodotus and His Sources: Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* [tr. of Fehling (1971) by J.G. Howie] (ARCA 21) (Leeds)
- (1991) *Die Ursprüngliche Geschichte vom Fall Trojas, oder, Interpretationen zur Troja-Geschichte* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft: Sonderheft 75) (Innsbruck)
- Felson-Rubin, N. (1994) *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics* (Princeton, NJ)
- Fenik, B. (1964) *Iliad X and the Rhesus: The Myth* (Brussels–Berchem)
- (1968) *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description* (Wiesbaden)
- Fenno, J. (2008) 'The Wrath and Vengeance of Swift-Footed Aeneas in *Iliad* 13', *Phoenix* 62, 145–61
- Fernandelli, M. (2012) *Catullo e la Rinascita dell' Epos: Dal Carme 64 all' Eneide* (Spudasmata 142) (Hildesheim)
- Finglass, P.J. (2011) *Sophocles: Ajax* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 48) (Cambridge)
- (2012) 'The *Geryoneis*. Review of Curtis (2011)', *CR* 62, 354–57
- Finkelberg, M. (1988) 'Ajax's Entry in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*', *CQ* 38, 31–41
- (1995) 'Odysseus and the Genus "Hero"', *G&R* 42, 1–14
- (1998) *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece* (Oxford)
- (2002) 'The Sources of *Iliad* 7', *ColbyQ* 38, 151–61
- (2003) 'Homer as a Foundation Text', in M. Finkelberg and G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond* (Leiden) 75–96
- (2011) 'Homer and His Peers: Neoanalysis, Oral Theory, and the Status of Homer', *TC* 3, 197–208
- (2015) 'Meta-cyclic Epic and Homeric Poetry', in M. Fantuzzi and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge) 126–38
- (2018) 'The Formation of the Homeric Epics', in F.-H. Mutschler (ed.), *Singing the World. The Homeric Epics and the Chinese Book of Songs: Foundational Texts Compared* (Newcastle Upon Tyne) 15–38
- Finnegan, R.H. (1977) *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance, and Social Context* (Cambridge–New York, NY)
- Fleming, D.E. and Milstein, S.J. (2010) *The Buried Foundation of the Gilgamesh Epic: The Akkadian Huwawa Narrative* (Leiden–Boston, MA)
- Foley, J.M. (1991) *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington)
- (1999) *Homer's Traditional Art* (University Park)
- (2002) *How to Read an Oral Poem* (Urbana)
- (2011) 'Oral Dictated Texts', in M. Finkelberg (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia* (3 vols) (Oxford) II.603–4
- Foley, J.M. and Arft, J. (2015) 'The Epic Cycle and Oral Tradition', in M. Fantuzzi and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge)

- Fontaine, M. (2014) 'Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Comedy: Menander's *Kolax* in Three Roman Receptions (Naevius, Plautus and Terence's *Eunuchus*)', in S.D. Olson (ed.), *Ancient Comedy and Reception: Essays in Honor of Jeffrey Henderson* (Berlin–Boston, MA) 180–202
- Fontenrose, J. (1966) 'Typhon among the Arimoi', in L. Wallach (ed.), *The Classical Tradition. Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of H. Caplan* (Ithaca, NY) 64–82
- Ford, A.L. (1988) 'The Classical Definition of ῥαψωδία', *CP* 83, 300–307
- (1992) *Homer: The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca, NY–London)
- (1997) 'The Inland Ship: Problems in the Performance and Reception of Homeric Epic', in E.J. Bakker and A. Kahane (eds.), *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text* (Cambridge, MA) 83–109
- (2002) *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton, NJ)
- Fordyce, C.J. (1990) *Catullus: A Commentary* (Oxford)
- Forsyth, N. (1979) 'The Allurement Scene: A Typical Pattern in Greek Oral Epic', *CSCA* 12, 107–20
- Forte, A. (2017) 'Tracing Homeric Metaphor', PhD thesis, Harvard University
- Foster, B.R. (2007) *Akkadian Literature of the Late Period* (Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record 2) (Münster)
- Fowler, D. (1997) 'On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies', *MD* 39, 13–34 [repr. in Fowler (2000) 115–37]
- (2000) *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford)
- Fowler, R.L. (1987) *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies* (Phoenix Suppl. 21) (Toronto)
- (2004) 'The Homeric Question', in R.L. Fowler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge Companions to Literature) (Cambridge) 220–32
- (ed.) (2000–2013) *Early Greek Mythography* (2 vols). Vol. 1: *Text and Introduction* (2000). Vol. 2: *Commentary* (2013) (Oxford)
- Fratantuono, L. (2008) '*Velocem potuit domuisse puellam*: Propertius, Catullus, and Atalanta's Race', *Latomus* 67, 342–52
- Fuqua, C. (1981) 'Tyrtaeus and the Cult of Heroes', *GRBS* 22, 215–26
- Gaetano, F. (2016) 'Pratiche storiografiche di comunicazione: μνᾶσθαι e μνήμη fra Erodoto e il suo pubblico', *Lexis* 34, 105–15
- Gagné, R. (2009) 'A Wolf at the Table: Sympotic Perjury in Archilochus', *TAPA* 139, 251–74
- (2013) *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge)
- Gainsford, P. (2016) *Early Greek Hexameter Poetry* (G&R New Surveys in the Classics 43) (Cambridge)
- Gaisser, J.H. (1995) 'Threads in the Labyrinth: Competing Views and Voices in Catullus 64', *AJP* 116, 579–616 [repr. in Gaisser (ed.) (2007) 217–58]
- (ed.) (2007) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Catullus* (Oxford)
- Gale, M.R. (2012) 'Putting on the yoke of necessity: Myth, intertextuality and moral agency in Catullus 68', in I.M. Le M. Du Quesnay and A.J. Woodman (eds.), *Catullus: Poems, Books, Readers* (Cambridge) 184–211
- Gallavotti, C. (1976) 'I due incunaboli di Atene e di Pitecusa ed altre epigrafi archaiche', *RAL* 31, 207–38
- Gantz, T. (1996) *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, MD–London)
- Garcia Jr., L.F. (2013) *Homeric Durability: Telling Time in the Iliad* (Hellenic Studies 57) (Washington, DC)
- Garner, R.S. (1990) *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry* (London)
- Garvie, A.F. (1994) *Homer: Odyssey. Books VI–VIII* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics) (Cambridge)
- Gazis, G.A. (2018) *Homer and the Poetics of Hades* (Oxford)
- Gee, E. (2013) *Aratus and the Astronomical Tradition* (Classical Culture and Society) (New York, NY)
- Gell, A. (1998) *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory* (Oxford)
- Gély-Ghedira, V. (2000) *La nostalgie du moi: Echo dans la littérature européenne* (Collection Littérature européenne) (Paris)

- Gemoll, A. (1883) 'Die Beziehungen Zwischen Ilias und Odyssee', *Hermes* 18, 34–96
- Gentili, B. (1984) *Poesia e Pubblico nella Grecia Antica: Da Omero al V Secolo* [tr. as Gentili (1988)] (Collezione Storica) (Rome)
- (1988) *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century* [tr. of Gentili (1984) by A.T. Cole] (Baltimore, MD–London)
- Gentili, B., Bernardini, P., Cingano, E. and Giannini, P. (1995) *Pindaro: Le Pitiche* (Scrittori greci e latini) (Milan)
- George, A.R. (2003) *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts* (2 vols) (Oxford)
- Gerber, D.E. (1970) *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry* (Amsterdam)
- (1997) 'Elegy', in D.E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden–New York, NY–Cologne) 89–132
- (1999a) 'Pindar, Nemean Six: A Commentary', *HSCP* 99, 33–91
- (1999b) *Greek Iambic Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Loeb Classical Library 259) (Cambridge, MA–London)
- Gerhard, E. (1867) *Etruskische Spiegel. Vierter Theil* (Berlin)
- Gerhard, Y. (2011) 'La «coupe de Nestor»: reconstitution du vers 1', *ZPE* 176, 7–9
- Germain, G. (1954) *Genèse de l'Odyssée: Le Fantastique et le Sacré* (Paris)
- Germany, R. (2005) 'The Figure of Echo in the Homeric Hymn to Pan', *AJP* 126, 187–208
- Giannini, P. (1993) 'Il proemio, il sigillo e il libro di Teognide: alcune osservazioni', in R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e Innovazione nella Cultura Greca da Omero all'Età Ellenistica: Scritti in Onore di Bruno Gentili* (3 vols) (Rome) I. 377–91
- Goldhill, S. (1983) 'Narrative Structure in Bacchylides 5', *Eranos* 81, 65–81
- (1991) *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge)
- (2007) 'Review of Clarke, Currie, and Lyne (eds.) (2006)', *BMCR* 2007.06.17,
- González, J.M. (2013) *The Epic Rhapsode and His Craft: Homeric Performance in a Diachronic Perspective* (Hellenic Studies 47) (Cambridge, MA–London)
- (2015) 'A Diachronic Metapoetics of Reception: Homeric *kleos* (κλέος) and Biblical *zera'* (זֶרַע)', in J.M. González (ed.), *Diachrony: Diachronic Studies of Ancient Greek Literature and Culture* (Mythos Eikon Poiesis 7) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 79–179
- Goode, C.F. (2012) 'Tydeus and the Cadmaeans', *Kyklos Volume 1 – CHS Articles online*, <http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/5191>
- Gow, A.S.F. (ed.) (1952) *Theocritus*<sup>2</sup> (1950<sup>1</sup>) (2 vols). Vol. 1: *Introduction, Text, and Translation*. Vol. 2: *Commentary, Appendix, Indexes, & Plates* (Cambridge)
- Gow, A.S.F. and Schofield, A.F. (eds.) (1953) *Nicander: The Poems and Poetical Fragments. Edited with a Translation and Notes* (Cambridge)
- Graham, A.J. (1995) 'The Odyssey, History, and Women', in B. Cohen (ed.), *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey* (New York, NY–Oxford) 3–16
- Gray, V. (2011) 'Thucydides' Source Citations: "It is Said"', *CQ* 61, 75–90
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge Classical Studies) (Cambridge)
- Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. (2005) *Homer: The Resonance of Epic* (Classical Literature and Society) (London)
- (2010) *Homer: Iliad Book VI* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics) (Cambridge)
- Greene, E. (ed.) (1996) *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches* (Classics and Contemporary Thought 2) (Berkeley, CA–Los Angeles, CA–London)
- Grethlein, J. (2006a) *Das Geschichtsbild der Ilias: Eine Untersuchung aus Phänomenologischer und Narratologischer Perspektive* (Hypomnemata 163) (Göttingen)

- (2006b) 'How old is Nestor?', *Eikasmos* 17, 11–16
- (2007) 'Diomedes redivivus: A New Reading of Mimnermus fr. 14 W<sup>2</sup>', *Mnemosyne* 60, 102–11
- (2008) 'Memory and Material Objects in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*', *JHS* 128, 27–51
- (2017) 'The Best of the Achaeans? Odysseus and Achilles in the *Odyssey*', in C.C. Tsagalis and A. Markantonatos (eds.), *The Winnowing Oar – New Perspectives in Homeric Studies* (Berlin–Boston, MA) 121–42
- Griffin, J. (1977) 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer', *JHS* 97, 39–53
- (1980) *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford)
- (1995) *Homer Iliad IX, Edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford)
- Griffith, M. (1975) 'Man and the Leaves: A Study of Mimnermos fr. 2', *CSCA* 8, 73–88
- (1990) 'Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry', in M. Griffith and D.J. Mastronarde (eds.), *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer* (Atlanta) 185–207
- Griffith, R.D. (2013) 'Odysseus and the salt-ploughed field (Serv. on Verg., *Aen.* 2.81)', *Latomus* 72, 805–6
- Gronewald, M. and Daniel, R.W. (2004a) 'Ein neuer Sappho-Papyrus', *ZPE* 147, 1–8
- (2004b) 'Nachtrag zum neuen Sappho-Papyrus', *ZPE* 149, 1–4
- Guastella, G. (2017) *Word of Mouth: Fama and Its Personifications in Art and Literature from Ancient Rome to the Middle Ages* (Oxford)
- Haft, A.J. (1990) '"The City-Sacker Odysseus" in *Iliad* 2 and 10', *TAPA* 120, 37–56
- Hainsworth, J.B. (1988) 'Books V–VIII', in A. Heubeck, S.R. West and J.B. Hainsworth (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Vol. 1: Introduction and Books I–VIII* (Oxford) 247–385
- (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. 3: Books 9–12* (Cambridge)
- Haller, B.S. (2013) 'Dolios in *Odyssey* 4 and 24: Penelope's Plotting and Alternative Narratives of Odysseus's νόστος', *TAPA* 143, 263–92
- Halleran, M.R. (1997) 'It's Not What You Say: Unspoken Allusions in Greek Tragedy?', *MD* 39, 151–63
- Halliwell, J.M. (2009) 'Epiniian Precepts: A Study of Chiron and the Wise Adviser in Pindar', PhD thesis, University of Birmingham
- Halliwell, S. (2000) 'The Subjection of Muthos to Logos: Plato's Citations of the Poets', *CQ* 50, 94–112
- Hamilton, R. (1974) *Epiniion. General Form in the Odes of Pindar* (De proprietatibus litterarum. Series practica 91) (The Hague)
- Hampe, R. (1950) 'Die Homerische Welt im Lichte der neuen Ausgrabungen: Nestor', in R. Herbig (ed.), *Vermächtnis der Antiken Kunst: Gastvorträge zur Jahrhundertfeier der Archäologischen Sammlungen der Universität Heidelberg* (Heidelberg) 11–70
- Hansen, P.A. (1976) 'Pithecusan Humor. The Interpretation of "Nestor's Cup" Reconsidered', *Glotta* 54, 25–43
- Harder, M.A. (ed.) (2012) *Callimachus, Aetia: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary* (2 vols) (Oxford)
- (2013) 'From text to text. The impact of the Alexandrian library on the work of Hellenistic poets', in J. König, K. Oikonomopoulou and G. Woolf (eds.), *Ancient Libraries* (Cambridge) 96–108
- Hardie, A. (2005) 'Sappho, the Muses, and Life after Death', *ZPE* 154, 13–32
- Hardie, P.R. (1993) *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Roman Literature and its Contexts) (Cambridge–New York, NY)
- (2012) *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature* (Cambridge Classical Studies) (Cambridge)
- Harris, W.V. (1989) *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA)
- Harrison, S.J. (2007) *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace* (Oxford)

- Hartman, G.H. (1983) 'Reading aright: Keats's *Ode to Psyche*', in E. Cook, C. Hosěk, J. Macpherson, P. Parker and J. Patrick (eds.), *Centre and Labyrinth: Essays in Honour of Northrop Frye* (Toronto) 210–26
- Haubold, J. (2002) 'Greek Epic: A Near Eastern Genre?', *PCPS* 48, 1–19
- (2005) 'Heracles in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*', in R.L. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge) 85–98
- (2011) 'Lykien (und Kilikien) in der Ilias', in R. Rollinger and C. Ulf (eds.), *Lag Troia in Kilikien? Der Aktuelle Streit um Homers Ilias* (Darmstadt) 375–90
- (2013) *Greece and Mesopotamia: Dialogues in Literature* (Cambridge)
- Havelock, E.A. (1963) *Preface to Plato* (Oxford)
- Hawkins, T. (2001) 'Seducing a Misanthrope: Timon the Philogynist in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*', *GRBS* 42, 143–62
- (2008) 'Out-Foxing the Wolf-Walker: Lycambes as Performative Rival to Archilochus', *ClAnt* 27, 93–114
- (2016) 'Bupalus in Scheria: Hipponax's Odyssean Transcontextualizations', in L. Swift and C. Carey (eds.), *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches* (Oxford) 229–52
- Heath, M. and Okell, E. (2007) 'Sophocles' *Ajax*: Expect the Unexpected', *CQ* 57, 363–80
- Heerink, M. (2015) *Echoing Hylas: A Study in Hellenistic and Roman Metapoetics* (Wisconsin Studies in Classics) (Madison, WI)
- Heitsch, E. (ed.) (1961–64) *Die Griechischen Dichterfragmente der Römischen Kaiserzeit* (2 vols). *Abh. Akad. Wissensch. Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 3, Folge 49 (1961<sup>1</sup>, 1963<sup>2</sup>), 58 (1964) (Göttingen)
- (2005) 'Ilias und Aithiopis', *Gymnasium* 112, 431–41
- (2008) 'Neanalytische Antikritik: Zum Verhältnis Ilias — Aithiopis', *RhM* 151, 1–12
- Helbig, J. (1996) *Intertextualität und Markierung: Untersuchungen zur Systematik und Funktion der Signalisierung von Intertextualität* (Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte 3. Folge, Bd. 141) (Heidelberg)
- Helle, S. (forthcoming) 'A Narrative Device in Akkadian Epics? The Two-Act Structure', *JANER*
- Henderson, J. (1976) 'The Cologne Epode and the Conventions of Early Greek Erotic Poetry', *Arethusa* 9, 159–79
- Henkel, J.H. (2014) 'Vergil Talks Technique: Metapoetic Arboriculture in *Georgics* 2', *Vergilius* 60, 33–66
- Henkelman, W.F.M. (2006) 'The Birth of Gilgameš (Ael.NA XII.21). A Case-Study in Literary Receptivity', in R. Rollinger and B. Truschnegg (eds.), *Altertum und Mittelmeerraum: Die Antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante. Festschrift für Peter W. Haider zum 60. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart) 807–56
- Henrichs, A. (1993) 'Identity and Crisis in Hellenistic Literature: Response', in A.W. Bulloch, E.S. Gruen, A.A. Long and A.F. Stewart (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley, CA) 171–95
- Herter, H. (1980) 'Die Delphine des Dionysos', *Archaiognosia* 1, 101–34
- Heslin, P.J. (2005) *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius' Achilleid* (Cambridge)
- (2011) 'Achilles: Review of Burgess (2009)', *CR* 61, 356–57
- (2016) 'Ovid's Cynus and Homer's Achilles Heel', in L. Fulkerson and T. Stover (eds.), *Repeat Performances. Ovidian Repetition and the Metamorphoses* (Wisconsin Studies in Classics) (Madison, WI) 69–99
- (2018) *Propertius, Greek Myth, and Virgil: Rivalry, Allegory, and Polemic* (Oxford)
- Heubeck, A. (1974) *Die Homerische Frage: Ein Bericht über die Forschung der Letzten Jahrzehnte* (Erträge der Forschung 27) (Darmstadt)
- (1979) *Archaeologia Homerica Band III, Kapitel X: Schrift* (Göttingen)
- (1982) 'Zur neueren Homerforschung', *Gymnasium* 89, 385–447



- (1989) 'Books IX–XII', in A. Heubeck and A. Hoekstra (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. 2: *Books IX–XVI* (Oxford) 1–143
- (1992) 'Books XXIII–XXIV', in J. Russo, M. Fernández-Galiano and A. Heubeck (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. 3: *Books XVII–XXIV* (Oxford) 311–418
- Heyworth, S.J. (forthcoming) *Ovid: Fasti Book 3* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics) (Cambridge)
- Hinds, S. (1987) *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge Classical Studies) (Cambridge)
- (1995) 'Reflexive Annotation in Poetic Allusion', *Hermathena* 158, 41–51
- (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Roman Literature and its Contexts) (Cambridge)
- Hinge, G. (2006) *Die Sprache Alkmans: Textgeschichte und Sprachgeschichte* (Serta Graeca 24) (Wiesbaden)
- Hirschberger, M. (2004) *Gynaikōn Katalogos und Megalai Êhoiai: Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten Zweier Hesiodeischer Epen* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 198) (Munich)
- Hollander, J. (1981) *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley, CA–Los Angeles, CA)
- Hollis, A.S. (1992) 'Hellenistic Colouring in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *HSCP* 94, 269–85
- (2009) *Callimachus: Hecale. Second Edition with Introduction, Text, Translation, and Enlarged Commentary* (1990<sup>1</sup>) (Oxford)
- Hölscher, U. (1966) 'Review of Kullmann (1960)', *Gnomon* 38, 113–27
- (1967) 'Die Atridensage in der *Odyssee*', in H. Singer and B. von Wiese (eds.), *Festschrift für Richard Alewyn* (Cologne–Graz) 1–16 [tr. as Hölscher (1999)]
- (1999) 'The Atreid Story in the *Odyssey*', in I.J.F. de Jong (ed.), *Homer Critical Assessments*. Vol. 3: *Literary Interpretations* (London–New York, NY) 419–30 [tr. of (1967) by C. Krojzl and S.R. van der Mije]
- Hooker, J.T. (1977) *The Language and Text of the Lesbian Poets* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 26) (Innsbruck)
- (1986) 'Helen and the Duration of the Trojan War', *PP* 41, 111–13
- (1992) 'Some Uses of the Greek Imperfect', in B. Brogyanyi and R. Lipp (eds.), *Historical Philology: Greek, Latin, and Romance: Papers in Honor of Oswald Szemerényi II* (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series IV, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 87) (Amsterdam)
- Hornblower, S. (ed.) (2015) *Lykophron: Alexandra: Greek Text, Translation, Commentary, and Introduction* (Oxford)
- Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A. and Eidinow, E. (eds.) (2012) *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*<sup>4</sup> (1949<sup>1</sup>, eds. M. Cary et al. 1970<sup>2</sup>, eds. N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard. 1996<sup>3</sup>, eds. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth, rev. 2003) (Oxford)
- Horsfall, N. (1990) 'Virgil and the Illusory Footnote', in F. Cairns and M. Heath (eds.), *PLLS 6: Roman Poetry and Drama, Greek Epic, Comedy, Rhetoric* (ARCA 29) (Leeds) 49–63
- (2016) *The Epic Distilled: Studies in the Composition of the Aeneid* (Oxford)
- Hörschele, R. (2018) 'Κραδία γνωστός ἐνεστι τύπος (Meleager, *Anth. Pal.* 5.212.4): Self-Reflexive Engagement with Lyric Topoi in Erotic Epigram', *Hellenistica Posnaniensia: Faces of Hellenistic Lyric. Aitia* 8.1, <http://journals.openedition.org/aitia/1979>
- Howie, J.G. (1983) 'The Revision of Myth in Pindar *Olympian* 1', in F. Cairns (ed.) *PLLS 4* (ARCA 11) (Liverpool) 277–313
- Hubbard, T.K. (1987) 'Two Notes on the Myth of Aeacus in Pindar', *GRBS* 28, 5–22
- (1991) *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 49) (Ithaca, NY–London)

- (2004) 'The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Reperformance, Written Texts', in C.J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Context* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 5) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 248) (Leiden–Boston, MA) 71–93
- (2007) 'Theognis' *Sphrêgis*: Aristocratic Speech and the Paradoxes of Writing', in C. Cooper (ed.), *Politics of Orality* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 6) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 280) (Leiden) 193–215
- Hughes, J.M.F. and Tracy, K. (2015) 'Indexicality', in K. Tracy, C. Ilie and T.L. Sandel (eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction* (3 vols) (Chichester) II. 788–93
- Hummel, P. (1993) *La Syntaxe de Pindare* (Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale 24) (Leuven–Paris)
- Hunter, R.L. (2012) 'The Songs of Demodokos: Compression and Extension in Greek Narrative Poetry', in M. Baumbach and S. Bär (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and its Reception* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies) (Leiden) 83–109
- (2014) *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days* (Cambridge Classical Studies) (Cambridge)
- (2015) *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautica Book IV* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics) (Cambridge)
- (2018) *The Measure of Homer: The Ancient Reception of the Iliad and the Odyssey* (Cambridge)
- Hunter, R.L. and Lämmle, R. (forthcoming) 'Enkelados: Callimachus fr. 1.36', *CP*
- Hunter, R.L. and Uhlig, A.S. (eds.) (2017) *Imagining Reperformance in Ancient Culture: Studies in the Traditions of Drama and Lyric* (Cambridge Classical Studies) (Cambridge–New York, NY)
- Hutchinson, G.O. (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Commentary on Selected Large Pieces: Alcman, Stesichorus, Sappho, Alcaeus, Ibycus, Anacreon, Simonides, Bacchylides, Pindar, Sophocles, Euripides* (Oxford)
- Huxley, G.L. (1969) *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London)
- (1973) 'The Date of Pherekydes of Athens', *GRBS* 14, 137–43
- (1975) *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast)
- Iff-Noël, F. (forthcoming) 'Mémoire', in J.-P. Guez, F. Klein, J. Peigney and É. Prioux (eds.), *Dictionnaire des images métapoétiques anciennes* (Paris)
- Ingleheart, J. (2010) 'The Literary "Successor": Ovidian Metapoetry and Metaphor', *CQ* 60, 167–72
- Irwin, E. (1998) 'Biography, Fiction, and the Archilochean *ainos*', *JHS* 118, 177–83
- (2005) *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation* (Cambridge Classical Studies) (Cambridge)
- Isler, H.P. (1970) *Acheloos: Eine Monographie* (Schweizerische Geisteswissenschaftliche Gesellschaft. Travaux 11) (Bern)
- Jacoby, F. (1947) 'The First Athenian Prose Writer', *Mnemosyne* 13, 13–64
- Jaillard, D. (2011) 'The Seventh Homeric Hymn to Dionysus: An Epiphanic Sketch', in A. Faulkner (ed.), *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays* (Oxford) 133–50
- James, A.W. (1975) 'Dionysus and the Tyrrhenian Pirates', *Antichthon* 9, 17–34
- Janko, R. (1982) *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction* (Cambridge)
- (1986) 'The Shield of Heracles and the Legend of Cynus', *CQ* 36, 38–59
- (1990) 'Mimnermus, Fragment 4 West: A Conjecture', *AJP* 111, 154–55
- (1992) *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4: Books 13–16 (Cambridge)
- (1998) 'The Homeric Poems as Oral Dictated Texts', *CQ* 48, 1–13
- (2012) 'πρῶτον τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν αἰεῖν: Relative Chronology and the Literary History of the Early Greek Epos', in Ø. Andersen and D.T.T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge) 20–43
- (2015) 'From Gabii and Gordion to Eretria and Methone: The Rise of the Greek Alphabet', *BICS* 58, 1–32

- (2017) 'Tithonus, Eos and the Cicada in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* and Sappho fr. 58', in C.C. Tsagalis and A. Markantonatos (eds.), *The Winnowing Oar – New Perspectives in Homeric Studies* (Berlin–Boston, MA) 267–96
- Jáuregi, M.H. de (2013) 'Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: The Olympian Portrait of the God', in A. Bernabé, M.H. de Jáuregui, A.I.J.S. Cristóbal and R.M. Hernández (eds.), *Redefining Dionysos* (Mythos Eikon Poiesis 5) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 235–49
- Jensen, M.S. (2011) *Writing Homer: A Study Based on Results from Modern Fieldwork* (Scientia Danica. Series H, Humanistica 8 vol. 4) (Copenhagen)
- Jocelyn, H.D. (1993) 'Hesiod, *Works and Days* 582–96 and Alcaeus, fr. 347 (Lobel–Page)', in H.D. Jocelyn and H. Hurt (eds.), *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent* (Liverpool) 87–95
- Jones, B. (2010) 'Relative Chronology Within (an) Oral Tradition', *CJ* 105, 289–318
- Jones, G.S. (2010) 'Echoes of the Attic Skolia in Sophokles' *Ajax*' [Online] Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1607974> [Accessed: 7 November 2017]
- Jones, P.V. (1992) 'The Past in Homer's *Odyssey*', *JHS* 112, 74–90
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1985) 'Iliad I. 366–392: A Mirror Story', *Arethusa* 18, 5–22
- (1994) 'Between Word and Deed: Hidden Thoughts in the *Odyssey*', in I.J.F. de Jong and J.P. Sullivan (eds.), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 130) (Leiden–New York, NY–Cologne) 27–50 [repr. in Doherty (ed.) (2009) 62–90]
- (2001) *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge)
- (2004) *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*<sup>2</sup> (1987<sup>1</sup>: Amsterdam) (London)
- (2006) 'The Homeric Narrator and His Own Kleos', *Mnemosyne* 59, 188–207
- (2007) 'Homer', in I.J.F. de Jong and R. Nünlist (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Vol. 2) (Mnemosyne Suppl. 291) (Leiden) 17–37
- (2010) 'Eos en Tithonus in de nieuwe Sappho (en bij andere dichters)', *Lampas* 43, 150–67
- (2011) 'The Shield of Achilles: From Metalepsis to Mise en Abyme', *Ramus* 40, 1–14
- (2012) *Homer: Iliad Book XXII* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics) (Cambridge)
- (2014) *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide* (Oxford)
- Jörgensen, O. (1904) 'Das Auftreten der Goetter in den Buechern ι–μ der Odyssee', *Hermes* 39, 357–82
- Jouan, F. (1966) *Euripide et les Légendes des Chants Cypriens: Des Origines de la Guerre de Troie à l' Iliade* (Collection d'études anciennes) (Paris)
- Kakridis, J.T. (1930a) 'Τιθωνός', *WS* 48, 25–38
- (1930b) 'Die Pelopssage bei Pindar', *Philologus* 85, 463–77
- (1949) *Homeric Researches* [tr. by A. Placotari] (Skrifter utgivna av Kungliga Humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 45) (Lund)
- (1966) 'Zu Sappho 44 LP', *WS* 79, 21–26
- Kakridis, P.T. (1995) 'Odysseus und Palamedes', in Ø. Andersen and M. Dickie (eds.), *Homer's World: Fiction, Tradition, Reality* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 3) (Bergen) 91–100
- Karanika, A. (2011) 'The End of the *Nekyia*: Odysseus, Heracles, and the Gorgon in the Underworld', *Arethusa* 44, 1–27
- (2013) 'Wedding and Performance in Homer: A View in the "Teichoskopia"', *TC* 5, 208–233
- Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (eds.) (1983– ) *Poetae Comici Graeci* (8 vols). Vol. 1: *Comoedia Dorica, mimi, phlyaces* (2001). Vol. 2: *Agathenor – Aristonymus* (1991). Vol. 3, 2: *Aristophanes. Testimonia et fragmenta* (1984). Vol. 4: *Aristophan – Crobylus* (1983). Vol. 5: *Damoxenus – Magnes* (1986). Vol. 6, 2: *Menander. Testimonia et fragmenta apud scriptores servata* (1998). Vol. 7: *Menecrates – Xenophon* (1989). Vol. 8: *Adespota* (1995) (Berlin–New York, NY)
- Katz, M.A. (1991) *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey* (Princeton, NJ)
- Kayachev, B. (2016) 'Catalepton 9 and Hellenistic Poetry', *CQ* 66, 180–204

- Keith, A.M. (1992) *The Play of Fictions: Studies in Ovid's Metamorphoses Book 2* (Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity) (Ann Arbor, MI)
- Kelly, A. (2006) 'Neoanalysis and the "Nestorbedrängnis": A Test Case', *Hermes* 134, 1–25
- (2007a) *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Iliad VIII* (Oxford Classical Monographs) (Oxford)
- (2007b) 'Stesikhoros and Helen', *MH* 64, 1–21
- (2008a) 'Performance and Rivalry: Homer, Odysseus and Hesiod', in M. Revermann and P. Wilson (eds.), *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford) 176–203
- (2008b) 'The Babylonian Captivity of Homer: The Case of the Διὸς Ἀπάτη', *RhM* 151, 259–304
- (2010) 'Hypertexting with Homer: Tlepolemus and Sarpedon on Heracles (Il. 5.628–698)', in C.C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Homeric Hypertextuality. TC 2.2*, 259–276
- (2012) 'The Mourning of Thetis: "Allusion" and the Future in the *Iliad*', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (TC Suppl. 12) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 221–65
- (2014) 'Homeric Battle Narrative and the Ancient Near East', in D.L. Cairns and R. Scodel (eds.), *Defining Greek Narrative* (Edinburgh) 29–54
- (2015a) 'Stesichorus' Homer', in P.J. Finglass and A. Kelly (eds.), *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge) 21–44
- (2015b) 'Review of Bakker (2013)', *Mnemosyne* 68, 677–81
- (2017) 'Analysing Homer or Why the world hates Oxford Classicists (aka the non-reception of Homer in Sappho)', Paper Presented at 'Reading Homer and Virgil in Antiquity' A Caucus Seminar Series, Cambridge, 8 Feb. 2017
- (2018a) 'Intraformularity in *epos*', Paper Presented at 'New Directions in Homeric Formulae', SCS Meeting 2018, Boston, MA, January 4–7
- (2018b) 'Homer's Rivals? Internal Narrators in the *Iliad*', in J.L. Ready and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homer in Performance: Rhapsodes, Narrators, and Characters* (Ashley and Peter Larkin Endowment in Greek and Roman Culture) (Austin, TX) 351–77
- (forthcoming) 'Homer and Hipponax', in V. Cazzato and E.E. Prodi (eds.), *Framing Hipponax* (Cambridge)
- Kelly, A. and Metcalf, C. (eds.) (forthcoming) *Divine Narratives in Greece and the Near East* (Oxford)
- Kenens, U. (2011) 'The Sources of Ps.-Apollodorus's *Library*: A Case-Study', *QUCC* 97, 129–46
- Kerényi, K. (1939) 'Die Geburt der Helena', *Mnemosyne* VII, 161–79
- Kern, H. (1918) 'Der antike Astyanax-Mythus und seine späteren Auswüchse', *Philologus* 75, 183–201
- King, H. (1986) 'Tithonos and the Tettix', *Arethusa* 19, 15–35
- Kirk, G.S. (1950) 'The Michigan Alcidas-Papyrus; Heraclitus Fr. 56D; The Riddle of the Lice', *CQ* 44, 149–167
- (1962) *The Songs of Homer* (Cambridge)
- (1985) *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. 1: Books 1–4* (Cambridge)
- (1990) *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. 2: Books 5–8* (Cambridge)
- Kivilo, M. (2010) *Early Greek Poets' Lives: The Shaping of the Tradition* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 322) (Leiden)
- Knight, V. (1995) *The Renewal of Epic: Responses to Homer in the Argonautica of Apollonius* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 152) (Leiden)
- Knox, B.M.W. (1985) 'Books and Readers in the Greek World', in Easterling, P. E. and B.M.W. Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Vol. 1: Greek Literature* (Cambridge) 1–41
- Köhnken, A. (1971) *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar; Interpretationen zu Sechs Pindar-Gedichten* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 12) (Berlin–New York, NY)
- (1974) 'Pindar as Innovator: Poseidon Hippios and the Relevance of the Pelops Story in Olympian 1', *CQ* 24, 199–206
- (1975) 'Gods and Descendants of Aiakos in Pindar's Eighth Isthmian Ode', *BICS* 22, 25–36

- Koller, H. (1972) 'Ἑπός', *Glotta* 50, 16–24
- Koning, H.H. (2010) *Hesiod: The Other Poet: Ancient Reception of a Cultural Icon* (Leiden)
- Kopff, E. (1983) 'The Structure of the Amazonia (Aethiopia)', in R. Häag (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century BC: Tradition and Innovation* (Stockholm) 57–62
- Korenjak, M. (1998) 'Homerische Intertextualität ohne Formeln? Zwei phorminxspielende Helden in Ilias und Odyssee', *MD* 40, 133–43
- Koster, W.J.W. and Holwerda, D. (eds.) (1960–2007) *Scholia in Aristophanem* (4 parts). **Pars I:** Fasc. 1a, *Prolegomena de Comoedia* (ed. W.J.W. Koster, 1975); Fasc. 1b, *Scholia in Acharnenses* (ed. N.G. Wilson, 1975); Fasc. 2, *Scholia in Equites* (eds. D. Mervyn Jones and N.G. Wilson, 1969); Fasc. 3.1, *Scholia Vetera in Nubes* (ed. D. Holwerda, 1977); Fasc. 3.2, *Scholia Recentiora in Nubes* (ed. W.J.W. Koster, 1974). **Pars II:** Fasc. 1, *Scholia in Vespas* (ed. W.J.W. Koster, 1978); Fasc. 2, *Scholia in Pacem* (ed. D. Holwerda, 1982); Fasc. 3, *Scholia in Aves* (ed. D. Holwerda, 1991); Fasc. 4, *Scholia in Lysistratam* (ed. J. Hangard, 1996). **Pars III:** Fasc. 1a, *Scholia Vetera in Ranais* (ed. M. Chantry, 1999); Fasc. 1b, *Scholia Recentiora in Ranais* (ed. M. Chantry, 2001); Fasc. 2/3, *Scholia in Thesmophoriazusas et Ecclesiazusas* (ed. R. F. Regtuit, 2007); Fasc. 4a, *Scholia Vetera in Plutum* (ed. M. Chantry, 1994); Fasc. 4b, *Scholia Recentiora in Plutum* (ed. M. Chantry, 1996). **Pars IV:** *Jo. Tzetzae commentarii in Aristophanem*: Fasc. 1, *in Plutum* (ed. L. Massa Positano, 1960); Fasc. 2, *in Nubes* (ed. D. Holwerda, 1960); Fasc. 3, *in Ranais et Aves* (ed. W.J.W. Koster, 1962); Fasc. 4, *Indices* (1964) (Groningen)
- Kowalzig, B. (2007) *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Oxford Classical Monographs) (Oxford)
- Kozak, L. (2017) *Experiencing Hektor: Character in the Iliad* (London)
- Kristeva, J. (1980) *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (ed. L.S. Roudiez) [tr. by T. Gora, A. Jardine and L.S. Roudiez] (New York, NY)
- Kugelmeier, C. (1996) *Reflexe Früher und Zeitgenössischer Lyrik in der Alten Attischen Komödie* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 80) (Berlin–Boston, MA)
- Kullmann, W. (1955) 'Ein vorhomerisches Motiv im Iliasproömium', *Philologus* 99, 167–92 [repr. in Kullmann (1992) 11–35]
- (1956a) 'Zur Διὸς βουλή des Iliasproömium', *Philologus* 100, 132–33 [repr. in Kullmann (1992) 36–37]
- (1956b) *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias: Untersuchungen zur Frage der Entstehung des Homerischen 'Götterapparats'* (Berlin)
- (1960) *Die Quellen der Ilias: Troischer Sagenkreis*. (Hermes Einzelschriften 14) (Wiesbaden)
- (1968) 'Vergangenheit und Zukunft in der Ilias', *Poetica* 2, 15–37 [repr. in Kullmann (1992) 219–42, tr. as Kullmann (2001)]
- (1984) 'Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research', *GRBS* 25, 307–23 [repr. in Kullmann (1992) 140–55]
- (1992) *Homerische Motive: Beiträge zur Entstehung, Eigenart und Wirkung von Ilias und Odyssee* (ed. R.J. Müller) (Stuttgart)
- (2001) 'Past and Future in the Iliad', in D.L. Cairns (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford) 385–408 [tr. of Kullmann (1968)]
- (2005) 'Ilias und Aethiopia', *Hermes* 133, 9–28
- (2012) 'Neoanalysis between Orality and Literacy: Some Remarks Concerning the Development of Greek Myths including the Legend of the Capture of Troy', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (TC Suppl. 12) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 13–25
- (2015) 'Motif and Source Research: Neoanalysis, Homer, and Cyclic Epic', in M. Fantuzzi and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge) 108–25

- Kurke, L. (1990) 'Pindar's Sixth *Pythian* and the Tradition of Advice Poetry', *TAPA* 120, 85–107
- (2013) *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (1991<sup>1</sup>) (California Classical Studies 1) (Berkeley, CA)
- La Penna, A. (1964) 'Litteratura Esopica e letteratura Assiro-Babilonese I. Una favola di Archiloco e il poemetto di Etana', *RFIC* 92, 24–39
- Labarbe, J. (1949) *L'Homère de Platon* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liège 117) (Liège)
- Lachenaud, G. (ed.) (2010) *Scholies à Apollonios de Rhodes Traduites et Commentées* (Fragments 9) (Paris)
- Lamari, A.A. (2010) *Narrative, Intertext, and Space in Euripides' Phoenissae* (TC Suppl. 6) (Berlin–New York, NY)
- Lambole, J.-L. (2001) 'La coupe de Nestor. État de la question et essai de mise au point', *Gaia* 5, 29–39
- Lang, M. (1983) 'Reverberation and Mythology in the *Iliad*', in C. Rubino and C. Shemerline (eds.), *Approaches to Homer* (Austin, TX) 140–64
- Lardinois, A. (2008) "'Someone I Say, Will Remember Us': Oral Memory in Sappho's Poetry", in E.A. Mackay (ed.), *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 7) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 298) (Leiden–Boston, MA) 79–96
- (2009) 'The New Sappho Poem (P.Köln 21351 and 21376): Key to the Old Fragments', in E. Greene and M.B. Skinner (eds.), *The New Sappho on Old Age: Textual and Philosophical Issues* (Cambridge, MA–London) 41–57
- (2018) 'Eastern Myths for Western Lies: Allusions to Near Eastern Mythology in Homer's *Iliad*', *Mnemosyne* 71, 895–919.
- (forthcoming) 'Playing with Tradition: Deliberate Allusions to Near Eastern Myth in Hesiod's Story of the Five Human Races', in A. Kelly and C. Metcalf (eds.), *Divine Narratives in Greece and the Near East* (Oxford)
- Larson, J. (2001) *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore* (Oxford)
- (2002) 'Corinna and the Daughters of Asopus', *SyllClass* 13, 47–62
- Latacz, J. (1990) 'Die Funktion des Symposions für die entstehende griechische Literatur', *ScriptOralia* 30, 227–64
- (1996) *Homer, His Art and His World* [tr. by J.P. Holoka] (Ann Arbor, MI)
- Lavigne, D. (2017) 'Ἰσος ἰαμβικός: Archilochean Iambos and the Homeric Poetics of Conflict', in P. Bassino, L.G. Canavero and B. Graziosi (eds.), *Conflict and Consensus in Early Hexameter Poetry* (Cambridge) 132–53
- Leaf, W. (1886–88) *The Iliad. Edited with English Notes and Introduction* (2 vols). Vol. 1: Books I.–XII. Vol. 2: Books XIII.–XXIV. (London)
- (1912) *Troy: A Study in Homeric Geography* (London)
- Lefkowitz, M.R. (1969) 'Bacchylides' Ode 5: Imitation and Originality', *HSCP* 73, 45–96
- (1984) 'The Poet as Athlete', *Journal of Sport History* 11, 18–24
- Lentini, G. (2006) *Il 'padre di Telemaco': Odisseo tra Iliade e Odissea* (Biblioteca di MD 18) (Pisa)
- Leone, P.L. (ed.) (2002) *Scholia Vetera et Paraphrases in Lycophronis Alexandram* (Galatina)
- Lesky, A. (1961) 'Göttliche und menschliche Motivation im homerischen Epos. Sitz. der Heidelberger Akad. der Wissensch., Phil.-hist. Klasse, Jahrg. 1961, 4 (Heidelberg)
- von Leutsch, E. (1859) 'Pindarische studien. II', *Philologus* 14, 45–68
- LeVen, P.A. (2018) 'Echo and the Invention of the Lyric Listener', in F. Budelmann and T. Phillips (eds.), *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece* (Oxford) 213–33
- Liberman, G. (1999) *Alcée: Texte Établi, Traduit et Annoté* (Collection des universités de France 392, 2 vols) (Paris)
- Lidov, J.B. (1974) 'The Poems and Performance of Isthmians 3 and 4', *CSCA* 7, 175–85

- Lightfoot, J.L. (ed.) (2009) *Hellenistic Collection: Philitas, Alexander of Aetolia, Hermesianax, Euphorion, Parthenius* (Loeb Classical Library 508) (Cambridge, MA–London)
- (2014) *Dionysius Periegetes: Description of the Known World: With Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford)
- Littlewood, R.J. (2006) *A Commentary on Ovid's Fasti, Book 6* (Oxford)
- (2011) *A Commentary on Silius Italicus' Punica 7* (Oxford)
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1981) 'Remarks on the Homeric Question', in H. Lloyd-Jones, V. Pearl and B. Worden (eds.), *History & Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper* (London) 15–29 [repr. in Lloyd-Jones (1990) 3–20]
- (1984) 'The Meropis (SH 903 A)', in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* (Naples) I. 141–52 [repr. in Lloyd-Jones (1990) 21–29]
- (1990) *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford)
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and Wilson, N.G. (eds.) (1990) *Sophocles Fabulae* (Oxford)
- Lobel, E. (1957) 'P.Oxy.2388. Alcman', in E. Lobel, C.H. Roberts, E.G. Turner and J.W.B. Barns (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XXIV* (Graeco-Roman memoirs no.35) (London) 22–27
- Lohmann, D. (1970) *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 6) (Berlin)
- (1988) *Die Andromache-Szenen der Ilias: Ansätze und Methoden der Homer-Interpretation* (Spudasmata 42) (Hildesheim–New York, NY)
- Lohse, G. (1964–67) 'Untersuchungen über Homerzitate bei Platon, Pts.1–3', *Helikon* 4, 3–28; 5, 248–95; 7, 223–31
- Loney, A.C. (2014) 'Hesiod's Incorporative Poetics in the *Theogony* and the Contradictions of Prometheus', *AJP* 135, 503–31
- Lonsdale, S.H. (1989) 'If Looks Could Kill: *παπταίνω* and the Interpenetration of Imagery and Narrative in Homer', *CJ* 84, 325–33
- López-Ruiz, C. (2010) *When the Gods Were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East* (Cambridge, MA–London)
- (2014) 'Greek and Near Eastern Mythologies: A Story of Mediterranean Encounters', in L. Edmunds (ed.), *Approaches to Greek Myth. Second Edition* (Baltimore, MD) 154–99
- Lord, A.B. (1953) 'Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts', *TAPA* 84, 124–34
- (1960) *The Singer of Tales* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 24) (Cambridge, MA–London)
- Lord, M.L. (1967) 'Withdrawal and Return: An Epic Story Pattern in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter and in the Homeric Poems', *CJ* 62, 241–48
- Loscalzo, D. (1988) 'Il fr. 180 S.–M. di Pindaro', *QUCC* 29, 71–75
- Louden, B. (2011) *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East* (Cambridge)
- (2018) 'The Homeric Epics and Other Texts: Review of Currie (2016)', *CR* 68, 14–16
- Lovell, C. (2011) 'The Overburdened Earth: Landscape and Geography in Homeric Epic', PhD thesis, The University of Texas at Austin
- Lowe, D. (2013) 'Women Scorned: A New Stichometric Allusion in the *Aeneid*', *CQ* 63, 442–445
- (2014) 'A Stichometric Allusion to Catullus 64 in the *Culex*', *CQ* 64, 862–65
- Lowenstam, S. (1992) 'The Uses of Vase-Depictions in Homeric Studies', *TAPA* 122, 165–98
- (1993) 'The Arming of Achilles on Early Greek Vases', *ClAnt* 12, 199–218
- (1997) 'Talking Vases: The Relationship between the Homeric Poems and Archaic Representations of Epic Myth', *TAPA* 127, 21–76
- Lowrie, M. (1992) 'A Sympotic Achilles, Horace *Epode* 13', *AJP* 113, 413–33
- Luginbill, R.D. (2002) 'Tyrtaeus 12 West: Come Join the Spartan Army', *CQ* 52, 405–14
- Lulli, L. (2011) *Narrare in Distici: L'Elegia Greca Arcaica e Classica di Argomento Storico-Mitico* (Quaderni dei SemRom 13) (Rome)

- Luppino, A. (1959) 'Divagazioni e precisazioni sulla Pitica III di Pindaro', *RFIC* 37, 225–36
- Lyne, R. (2000) 'Ovid, Golding, and the "Rough Magic" of *The Tempest*', in A.B. Taylor (ed.), *Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems* (Cambridge) 150–64
- (2016) *Memory and Intertextuality in Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge)
- Lynn-George, M. (1987) *Epos: Word, Narrative and the Iliad* (Language, Discourse, Society Series) (Basingstoke)
- Mace, S.T. (1993) 'Amour, Encore! The Development of  $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  in Archaic Lyric', *GRBS* 34, 335–64
- Maciver, C.A. (2012) 'Representative Bees in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*', *CP* 107, 53–69
- Mackie, C.J. (1997) 'Achilles' Teachers: Chiron and Phoenix in the *Iliad*', *G&R* 44, 1–10
- (1998) 'Achilles in Fire', *CQ* 48, 329–38
- (2008) *Rivers of Fire: Mythic Themes in Homer's Iliad* (Washington, DC)
- Mackie, H.S. (2003) *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise* (Ann Arbor, MI)
- Macleod, C.W. (1982) *Homer Iliad Book XXIV* (Cambridge)
- (1983) 'Homer on Poetry and the Poetry of Homer', in *Collected Essays* (Oxford) 1–15
- Maehler, H. (1963) *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im Frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars* (Hypomnemata 3) (Göttingen)
- (2004) *Bacchylides: A Selection* (Cambridge)
- Magnelli, E. (2006) 'Il proemio della Corona di Filippo di Tessalonica e la sua funzione programmatica', in L. Cristante (ed.), *Incontri Triestini di Filologia Classica* 4 (2004–2005): *Atti del Convegno Internazionale: 'Phantasia. Il Pensiero per Immagini degli Antichi e dei Moderni'*. Trieste, 28–30 Aprile 2005 (Trieste) 393–404
- Malkin, I. (1998) *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley, CA)
- Mann, R. (1994) 'Pindar's Homer and Pindar's Myths', *GRBS* 35, 313–37
- Maravela, A. (2015) 'Demeter "Nods" to Aphrodite? Narrative Interactions between the "Homeric" *Hymn to Aphrodite* and the *Hymn to Demeter*', in F. Dell'Oro and O. Lagacherie (eds.), *Πολυφύρετη Γαίη: Mélanges de Littérature et Linguistique Offerts à Françoise Létoublon* (Gaia 18) (Grenoble) 157–72
- Marcaccini, C. (2001) *Costruire un'Identità, Scrivere la Storia: Archiloco, Paro e la Colonizzazione di Taso* (Studi e testi 20) (Florence)
- March, J.R. (1987) *The Creative Poet: Studies on the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry* (BICS Suppl. 49) (London)
- Marin, T. (2009) 'Le Enotrope, Palamede e la sosta dei Greci a Delo nei *Cypria*', *Lexis* 27, 365–80
- Marincola, J. (2005) 'Marcellus at Syracuse (Livy XXV,24,11–15): A Historian Reflects', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XII* (Brussels) 219–29
- Marjanović, L. (ed.) (1898) *Hrvatske Narodne Pjesme, III: Junačke Pjesme (Muhamedovske)* [Croatian Folk Songs, III: Heroic Songs (Muslim)] (Zagreb)
- Marks, J. (2003) 'Alternative Odysseys: The Case of Thoas and Odysseus', *TAPA* 133, 209–26
- (2005) 'The Ongoing Neikos: Thersites, Odysseus, and Achilleus', *AJP* 126, 1–31
- (2008) *Zeus in the Odyssey* (Hellenic Studies 31) (Washington, D.C.)
- (2010) 'Context as Hypertext: Divine Rescue Scenes in the *Iliad*', in C.C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Homeric Hypertextuality. TC 2.2*, 300–322
- Martin, R.P. (1989) *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Myth and Poetics) (Ithaca, NY–London)
- (1992) 'Hesiod's Metanastic Poetics', *Ramus* 21, 11–33
- (2005) 'Epic as Genre', in J.M. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic* (Blackwell companions to the ancient world. Literature and Culture) (Malden, MA–Oxford) 9–19
- (2013) 'Review of Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.) (2012)', *BMCR* 2013.09.21, <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2013/2013-09-21.html>



- Maslov, B. (2015) *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature* (Cambridge)
- Mason, H.C. (2015) 'The Hesiodic *Aspis*: Introduction and Commentary on vv. 139–237', PhD Thesis, University of Oxford
- Mastrorade, D.J. (1994) *Euripides: Phoenissae* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 29) (Cambridge)
- Mazur, P.S. (2010) 'Formulaic and Thematic Allusions in *Iliad* 9 and *Odyssey* 14', *CW* 104, 3–15
- McDermott, E.A. (1987) 'Medea Line 37: A Note', *AJP* 108, 158–61
- (1991) 'Double Meaning and Mythic Novelty in Euripides' Plays', *TAPA* 121, 123–32
- (2000) 'Euripides' Second Thoughts', *TAPA* 130, 239–59
- Merkelbach, R. (1969) *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee* (Zetemata 2) (Munich)
- Merkelbach, R. and West, M.L. (eds.) (1967) *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford)
- Metcalf, C. (2015) *The Gods Rich in Praise: Early Greek and Mesopotamian Religious Poetry* (Oxford)
- (2017) 'The Homeric Epics and the Anatolian Context: Review of Bachvarova (2016)', *CR* 67, 3–5
- Meuli, K. (1921) *Odyssee und Argonautika* (Berlin) [repr. in Meuli (1975) II. 593–676]
- (1975) *Gesammelte Schriften* (ed. T. Gelzer) (2 vols) (Basel)
- Meyerhoff, D. (1984) *Traditioneller Stoff und Individuelle Gestaltung. Untersuchungen zu Alkaios und Sappho* (Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 3) (Hildesheim)
- ní Mheallaigh, K. (2014) *Reading Fiction with Lucian: Fakes, Freaks and Hyperreality* (Greek Culture in the Roman World) (Cambridge)
- Michalopoulos, A. (2001) *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon* (ARCA 40) (Leeds)
- (2006) *Ovid Heroides 16 and 17: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (ARCA 47) (Cambridge)
- Michalowski, P. (2010) 'Maybe Epic: The Origins and Reception of Sumerian Heroic Poetry', in D. Konstan and K.A. Raafaub (eds.), *Epic and History* (Ancient World–Comparative Histories) (Oxford) 7–25
- Micozzi, L. (2015) 'Statius' Epic Poetry: A Challenge to the Literary Past', in W.J. Dominik, C.E. Newlands and K. Gervais (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Statius* (Brill's Companions in Classical Studies) (Leiden) 325–42
- Miller, A.M. (1994) 'Nestor and Sarpedon in Pindar, *Pythian* 3 (Again)', *RhM* 137, 383–86
- Miller, J.F. (1993) 'Ovidian Allusion and the Vocabulary of Memory', *MD* 30, 153–164
- (1994) 'The Memories of Ovid's Pythagoras', *Mnemosyne* 47, 473–487
- Minchin, E. (2001) *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey* (Oxford)
- (2005) 'Homer on Autobiographical Memory: The Case of Nestor', in R.J. Rabel (ed.), *Approaches to Homer, Ancient & Modern* (Swansea–Oakville, CT) 55–72
- (2006) 'Can One Ever Forget? Homer on the Persistence of Painful Memories', *Scholia* 15, 2–16
- (2007) *Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender* (Oxford)
- (2018) 'The *Odyssey* after the *Iliad*: Ties That Bind', in R. Simms (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Prequels, Sequels, and Retellings of Classical Epic* (Brill's Companions to Classical Reception 15) (Leiden–Boston) 9–30
- Miralles, C. and Pòrtulas, J. (1988) *The Poetry of Hipponax* (Filologia e critica 55) (Rome)
- Missiou, A. (2011) *Literacy and Democracy in Fifth-Century Athens* (Cambridge)
- von Möllendorff, P. (2011) 'Es war einmal...ein Becher des Nestor. Probleme der Intertextualität und Intermedialität am Beispiel des Skyphos von Ischia', in U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser, D. Pausch and M. Rühl (eds.), *Kultur der Antike: Transdisziplinäres Arbeiten in den Altertumswissenschaften* (Berlin) 413–33
- Monoson, S.S. (2000) *Plato's Democratic Entanglements, Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy* (Princeton, NJ)

- Monro, D.B. (1901) *Homer's Odyssey. Books XIII–XXIV* (Oxford)
- Montana, F. (2009) 'Terpandean Hypotexts in Aristophanes', *TC* 4, 36–54
- Montanari, F. (2012) 'Introduction: The Homeric Question Today', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (TC Suppl. 12) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 1–10
- Montanari, F., Rengakos, A. and Tsagalis, C.C. (eds.) (2012) *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (TC Suppl. 12) (Berlin–Boston, MA)
- Montiglio, S. (2000) *Silence in the Land of Logos* (Princeton, NJ)
- Moran, W.S. (1975) 'Μιμνήσκομαι and "Remembering" Epic Stories in Homer and the Hymns', *QUCC* 195–211
- Morgan, K.A. (2015) *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford–New York, NY)
- Morgan, L. (1999) *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's Georgics* (Cambridge)
- Morris, S.P. (1992) *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton, NJ)
- Morrison, A.D. (2007a) *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge)
- (2007b) *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes* (BICS Suppl. 95) (London)
- Morrison, J.V. (1992a) 'Alternatives to the Epic Tradition: Homer's Challenges in the *Iliad*', *TAPA* 122, 61–71
- (1992b) *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad* (Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity) (Ann Arbor, MI)
- Most, G.W. (1992) 'Il poeta nell'Ade: catabasi epica e teoria dell'epos tra Omero e Virgilio', *SIFC* 10, 1014–26
- (1993) 'Hesiod and the Textualization of Personal Temporality', in G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari (eds.), *La Componente Autobiografica nella Poesia Greca e Latina fra Realtà e Artificio Letterario: Atti del Convegno: Pisa, 16–17 Maggio 1991* (Biblioteca di studi antichi 51) (Pisa) 73–92
- (1998) 'Hesiod's Myth of the Five (or Three or Four) Races', *PCPS* 43, 104–27
- (2003) 'Violets in Crucibles: Translating, Traducing, Transmuting', *TAPA* 133, 381–90
- Mueller, Martin (2009) *The Iliad*<sup>2</sup> (1984<sup>1</sup>) (London)
- Mueller, Melissa (2007) 'Penelope and the Poetics of Remembering', *Arethusa* 40, 337–62
- Mülder, D. (1910) *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen* (Berlin)
- Müller, M.C.G. (ed.) (1811) *Ἰσαακίου καὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζέτζου σχόλια εἰς Ἀνκόφρονα* (3 vols) (Leipzig)
- Murray, O. (1994) 'Nestor's Cup and the Origins of the Greek Symposium', in B. d'Agostino and D. Ridgway (eds.), *Ἀποικία: Scritti in Onore di G. Buchner*, *AION(archeol)* 1, 47–54 [repr. in Murray (2018) 63–75]
- (2018) *The Symposion: Drinking Greek Style. Essays on Greek Pleasure 1983–2017* (ed. V. Cazzato) (Oxford–New York, NY)
- Murray, P. (1981) 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece', *JHS* 101, 87–100
- Musgrove, M.W. (1997) 'Change of Perspective in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 12.11–23', *AJP* 118, 267–83
- Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.) (1958) *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford)
- (ed.) (1969) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford)
- Nafissi, M. (1991) *La Nascita del Kosmos: Studi sulla Storia e la Società di Sparta* (Studi di storia e di storiografia) (Naples)
- Nagy, G. (1974) *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 33) (Cambridge, MA)
- (1979) *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore, MD)
- (1982) 'Hesiod', in T.J. Luce (ed.), *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome* (2 vols) (New York, NY) I. 43–73
- (1985) 'Theognis and Megara: A Poet's Vision of His City', in T.J. Figueira and G. Nagy (eds.), *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis* (Baltimore, MD–London) 22–81

- (1990a) *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Myth and Poetics) (Ithaca, NY)
- (1990b) *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (The Mary Flexner Lectures 1982) (Baltimore, MD)
- (1996a) *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge)
- (1996b) *Homeric Questions* (Austin, TX)
- (2003) *Homeric Responses* (Austin, TX)
- (2009) *Homer the Classic* (Hellenic Studies 36) (Cambridge, MA–London)
- (2010) 'Ancient Greek Elegy', in K. Weisman (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Elegy* (Oxford) 13–45
- (2011) 'Asopos and his Multiple Daughters: Traces of Preclassical Epic in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar', in D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry. Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford) 41–78
- (2014) 'Review of Jensen (2011)', *Gnomon* 86, 97–101
- (2015) 'Homeric Cross-Referencing to a Cyclic Tradition of Performance', in G. Scafoglio (ed.), *Studies on the Greek Epic Cycle. Vol. 1 (Philologia Antiqua 7, 2014)* (Pisa–Rome) 15–31
- Nasta, M. (2006) 'La typologie des catalogues d'Éhées: un réseau généalogique thématisé', *Kernos* 19, 59–78
- Nauta, R. (2013) 'Metalepsis and Metapoetics in Latin Poetry', in U.E. Eisen and P. von Möllendorff (eds.), *Über die Grenze: Metalepse in Text- und Bildmedien des Altertums* (Narratologia 39) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 223–56
- Nelson, S. (2005) 'Hesiod', in J.M. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic* (Malden, MA–Oxford) 330–43
- Nelson, T.J. (forthcoming a) 'The Shadow of Aristophanes: Hellenistic Poetry's Reception of Comic Poetics', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Drama and Performance in Hellenistic Poetry* (Hellenistica Groningana 23) (Leuven) 225–71
- (forthcoming b) 'Pas, Traces De Pas', in J.-P. Guez, F. Klein, J. Peigney and É. Prioux (eds.), *Dictionnaire des images métapoétiques anciennes* (Paris)
- (forthcoming c) 'Vol, Larcin', in J.-P. Guez, F. Klein, J. Peigney and É. Prioux (eds.), *Dictionnaire des images métapoétiques anciennes* (Paris)
- Nethercut, J.S. (2017) 'Empedocles' "Roots" in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*', *AJP* 138, 85–105.
- (2018) 'The Alexandrian Footnote in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*', *Mnemosyne* 71, 75–99
- (forthcoming) 'Lucretian Echoes: Sound as Metaphor for Literary Allusion in *DRN* 4.549–594', in D. O'Rourke (ed.), *Approaches to Lucretius* (Cambridge)
- Nicholson, N. (2000) 'Pederastic Poets and Adult Patrons in Late Archaic Lyric', *CW* 93, 235–59
- Nickel, R. (2003) 'The Wrath of Demeter: Story Pattern in the *Hymn to Demeter*', *QUCC* 73, 59–82
- Nikkanen, A. (2012) 'A Note on Memory and Reciprocity in Homer's *Odyssey*', in V. Bers, D.F. Elmer, D. Frame and L. Muellner (eds.), *Donum Natalicium Digitaliter Confectum Gregorio Nagy Septuagenario a Discipulis Collegis Familiaribus Oblatum*, <https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/4616> (Washington, D.C.)
- Niles, J.D. (1983) *Beowulf: The Poem and Its Tradition* (Cambridge, MA–London)
- Nilsson, M.P. (1932) *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* (Sather Classical Lectures 8) (Berkeley, CA)
- Nimis, S.A. (1987) *Narrative Semiotics in the Epic Tradition: The Simile* (Bloomington)
- Nisetich, F.J. (1977) 'Convention and Occasion in *Isthmian* 2', *CSCA* 10, 133–56
- (1989) *Pindar and Homer* (Baltimore, MD–London)
- Norden, E. (1957) *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI<sup>4</sup>* (Stuttgart)
- Notopoulos, J.A. (1938) 'Mnemosyne in Oral Literature', *TAPA* 69, 465–93
- (1966) 'Archilochus, the Aoidos', *TAPA* 97, 311–15
- Nünlist, R. (1998) *Poetologische Bildersprache in der Frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart)
- (2009) *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge)

- Obbink, D. (1995) *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace* (New York, NY–Oxford)
- (2011) 'Vanishing Conjecture: Lost Books and their Recovery from Aristotle to Eco', in D. Obbink and R.B. Rutherford (eds.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford) 20–49
- (2016a) 'The Newest Sappho: Text, Apparatus Criticus, and Translation', in A. Bierl and A. Lardinois (eds.), *The Newest Sappho: P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105, Frs. 1–4* (Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, Vol. 2) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 392) (Leiden–Boston, MA) 13–33
- (2016b) 'Ten Poems of Sappho: Provenance, Authenticity, and Text of the New Sappho Papyri', in A. Bierl and A. Lardinois (eds.), *The Newest Sappho: P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105, Frs. 1–4* (Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song, Vol. 2) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 392) (Leiden–Boston, MA) 34–54
- O'Hara, J.J. (2017) *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. New and expanded edition (1996<sup>1</sup>) (Ann Arbor, MI)
- Olson, S.D. (1990) 'The Stories of Agamemnon in Homer's *Odyssey*', *TAPA* 120, 57–71
- (1995) *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 148) (Leiden)
- (2012) *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite and Related Texts: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Texte und Kommentare 39) (Berlin–Boston, MA)
- O'Maley, J. (2011) 'Paradigm Introductions and Mytho-Historical Authority in the *Iliad*', in A. Mackay (ed.), *ASCS 32: Selected Proceedings*. Retrieved from <http://www.ascs.org.au/news/ascs32/O'Maley.pdf>
- (2014) 'Controlling the Web: Hypertextuality, the *Iliad*, and the Crimes of Previous Generations', in R.S. Scodel (ed.), *Between Orality and Literacy: Communication and Adaptation in Antiquity* (Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World, Vol. 10) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 367) (Leiden–Boston, MA) 6–28
- O'Neill, K. (1999) 'Ovid and Propertius: Reflexive Annotation in *Amores* 1.8', *Mnemosyne* 52, 286–307
- Ormand, K. (2013) 'Uncertain Geographies of Desire in the *Catalogue of Women: Atalanta*', in M. Skempis and I. Ziogas (eds.), *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic* (Berlin) 137–60
- (2014) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women and Archaic Greece* (New York, NY)
- (2017) 'Helen's Phantom in Fragments', in C.C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Poetry in Fragments: Studies on the Hesiodic Corpus and its Afterlife* (TC Suppl. 50) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 115–34
- Orr, M. (2003) *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge)
- Osborne, R. (1996) *Greece in the Making, 1200–479 BC* (Routledge History of the Ancient World) (London)
- Ostrowski, J.A. (1991) *Personifications of Rivers in Greek and Roman Art* (Studia z archeologii śródziemnomorskiej Zeszyt 12) (Kraków)
- Page, D.L. (1955a) *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry* (Oxford)
- (1955b) *The Homeric Odyssey: The Mary Flexner Lectures Delivered at Bryn Mawr College* (Oxford)
- (1961) 'The Sources of the *Iliad*. Review of Kullmann (1960)', *CR* 11, 205–9
- (ed.) (1962) *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford)
- (ed.) (1972) *Aeschlyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias* (Oxford)
- Pallantz, E. (2005) *Der Troische Krieg in der Nachhomerischen Literatur bis zum 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (*Hermes Einzelschriften* 94) (Stuttgart)
- Papageorgiou, P.N. (ed.) (1888) *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias Vetera* (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana) (Leipzig)
- Papaioannou, S. (2005) *Epic Succession and Dissension: Ovid, Metamorphoses 13.623–14.582, and the Reinvention of the Aeneid* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 73) (Berlin–New York, NY)

- Parry, A. (1966) 'Have we Homer's *Iliad*?', in A. Parry and G.S. Kirk (eds.), *Homeric Studies*. YCLS 20 (New Haven, CT–London) 175–216 [repr. in A. Parry (1989) 104–40]
- (1989) *The Language of Achilles and Other Papers* (Oxford)
- Pavese, C.O. (1966) 'χορήματα χορήματ' ἀνήρ ed il motivo della liberalità nella seconda *Istmica* di Pindaro', *QUCC* 2, 103–12
- (1991) 'L'inno rapsodico: analisi tematica degli inni omerici', in A.C. Cassio and G. Cerri (eds.), *L'Inno tra Rituale e Letteratura nel Mondo Antico. Atti di un Colloquio Napoli 21–24 Ottobre 1991* (A.I.O.N. 13) (Rome) 155–78
- (1996) 'La iscrizione sulla kotyle di Nestor da Pithekoussai', *ZPE* 114, 1–23
- Pavlou, M. (2008) 'Metapoetics, Poetic Tradition, and Praise in Pindar's *Olympian* 9', *Mnemosyne* 61, 533–67
- (2012) 'Pindar and the Reconstruction of the Past', in J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones and C. Maciver (eds.), *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras* (Edinburgh)
- Pedrick, V. (1983) 'The Paradigmatic Nature of Nestor's Speech in *Iliad* 11', *TAPA* 113, 55–68
- Pelliccia, H. (2011) 'Double Motivation', in M. Finkelberg (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia* (3 vols) (Oxford) I. 218–19
- Perry, B.E. (ed.) (1952) *Aesopica: A Series of Texts Relating to Aesop or Ascribed to Him or Closely Connected with the Literary Tradition that Bears his Name*. Vol. 1: *Greek and Latin Texts* (Urbana)
- Pertusi, A. (ed.) (1955) *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies* (Pubblicazioni della Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Nuova serie 53) (Milan)
- Pestalozzi, H. (1945) *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* (Erlenbach–Zürich)
- Peters, M. (1998) 'Homerisches und Unhomerisches bei Homer und auf dem Nestorbecher', in J.H. Jasanoff, H.C. Melchert and L. Olivier (eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of C. Watkins* (Innsbruck) 585–602
- Petropoulos, J.C.B. (1994) *Heat and Lust: Hesiod's Midsummer Festival Scene Revisited* (Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches) (Lanham, MD–London)
- (2011) *Kleos in a Minor Key: The Homeric Education of a Little Prince* (Hellenic Studies 45) (Washington, DC–Cambridge, MA)
- Pfeiffer, R. (ed.) (1949–53) *Callimachus* (2 vols). Vol. 1: *Fragmenta* (1949). Vol. 2: *Hymni et epigrammata* (1953) (Oxford)
- (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford)
- Pfeijffer, I.L. (1999) *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III & Pythian VIII* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 197) (Leiden)
- Phillippo, S. (2007) '"A Future for Astyanax": Alternative and Imagined Futures for Hector's Son in Classical and European Drama', *IJCT* 14, 321–74
- Phillips, E.D. (1957) 'A Suggestion about Palamedes', *AJP* 78, 267–78
- Phillips, T. (2015) 'Echo In Euripides' *Andromeda*', *GRMS* 3, 53–66
- (2016) *Pindar's Library: Performance Poetry and Material Texts* (Oxford Classical Monographs) (Oxford)
- Pontani, F. (ed.) (2007– ) *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam* (3 vols to date). Vol. 1: *Scholia ad Libros α – β* (2007). Vol. 2: *Scholia ad Libros γ – δ* (2010). Vol. 3: *Scholia ad Libros ε – ζ* (2015) (Pleiadi 6.1–3) (Rome)
- Porter, A. (2018) *Agamemnon, the Pathetic Despot: Reading Characterization in Homer* (Hellenic Studies 78) (Cambridge, MA)
- Powell, B.B. (1991) *Homer and the Origin of the Greek Alphabet* (Cambridge)
- Pratt, L. (1995) 'The Seal of Theognis, Writing, and Oral Poetry', *AJP* 116, 171–84
- (2009) 'Diomedes, the fatherless hero of the *Iliad*', in S.R. Hübner and D.M. Ratzan (eds.), *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity* (Cambridge) 141–61

- Prauscello, L. (2012) 'Epinician Sounds: Pindar and Musical Innovation', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R.J. Rawles (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge) 58–82
- Privitera, G.A. (1978–79) 'Le vittorie di Melisso nelle Istmiche III e IV', *Helikon* 18–19, 3–21
- Prodi, E.E. (2017) 'Text as Paratext: Pindar, Sappho, and Alexandrian Editions', *GRBS* 57, 547–82
- Pucci, J. (1998) *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition* (New Haven, CT–London)
- Pucci, P. (1977) *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore, MD–London)
- (1979) 'The Song of the Sirens', *Arethusa* 12, 121–32
- (1987) *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 46) (Ithaca, NY)
- Pulley, S. (1997) *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford Classical Monographs) (Oxford)
- (2000) *Homer Iliad I, Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford)
- Quint, D. (1983) *Origin and Originality in Renaissance Literature: Versions of the Source* (New Haven, CT)
- Radif, L. (2002) *L'Iliade al Quadrato: Retorica dell'Allusività e Miti Concorrenti* (Alessandria)
- Rawles, R. (2006) 'Notes on the Interpretation of the "New Sappho"', *ZPE* 157, 1–7
- (2018) *Simonides the Poet: Intertextuality and Reception* (Cambridge)
- Raynor, D.J. (2005) 'The Power of Memory in Erinna and Sappho', in E. Greene (ed.), *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Norman, OK) 59–71
- Ready, J.L. (2014) 'ATU 974 *The Homecoming Husband*, the Returns of Odysseus, and the End of *Odyssey* 21', *Arethusa* 47, 265–85
- (2015) 'The Textualization of Homeric Epic by Means of Dictation', *TAPA* 145, 1–75
- Redfield, J.M. (1975) *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector* (Chicago)
- Reece, S. (1994) 'The Cretan Odyssey: A Lie Truer Than Truth', *AJP* 115, 157
- (2005) 'Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: From Oral Performance to Written Text', in M.C. Amodio (ed.), *New Directions in Oral Theory* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 287) (Tempe, AZ) 43–89
- (2011) 'Penelope's "Early Recognition" of Odysseus from a Neoanalytic and Oral Perspective', in *Early Recognition in Homer's Odyssey*, *College Literature* 38.2, 101–17
- Reeson, J. (2001) *Ovid Heroides 11, 13 and 14: A Commentary* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 221) (Leiden–Boston, MA–Cologne)
- Reichel, M. (1994) *Fernbeziehungen in der Ilias* (*ScriptOralia* 62) (Tübingen)
- (1998) 'How Oral is Homer's Narrative?', in F. Cairns and M. Heath (eds.), *PLLS 10: Greek Poetry, Drama, Prose, Roman Poetry* (*ARCA* 38) (Leeds) 1–22
- Reinhardt, K. (1938) *Das Parisurteil* (*Wissenschaft und Gegenwart* 11) (Frankfurt am Main) [repr. in Reinhardt (1960) 16–36; tr. as 'The Judgement of Paris' in Jones and Wright (1997) 170–91]
- (1948) 'Die Abenteuer Der Odyssee', in *Von Werken und Formen: Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Godesberg) 52–162 [repr. in Reinhardt (1960) 47–124, of which pp. 77–87 and 112–24 tr. as 'Circe and Calypso' and 'The Phaeacians' in Jones and Wright (1997) 225–36, 236–48]
- (1960) *Tradition und Geist: Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung* (ed. C. Becker) (Göttingen)
- (1961) *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (ed. U. Hölscher) (Göttingen)
- Renehan, R. (1971) 'The Michigan Alcidas-Papyrus: A Problem in Methodology: For George Koniaris', *HSCP* 75, 85–105
- (1980) 'Review Article: Progress in Hesiod', *CP* 75, 339–58
- (1983) 'The Early Greek Poets: Some Interpretations', *HSCP* 87, 1–29
- (1985) 'Review Article: A New Commentary on Euripides', *CP* 80, 143–75
- Rengakos, A. (2004) 'Die *Argonautika* und das "kyklische Gedicht": Bemerkungen zur epischen Erzähltechnik', in A. Bierl, A. Schmitt and A. Willi (eds.), *Antike Literatur in Neuer Deutung. Festschrift für Joachim Latacz anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstages* (Munich–Leipzig) 277–304

- (2007) 'The Smile of Achilles, or the *Iliad* and its Mirror-Image', in M. Paizē-Apostolopoulou, A. Rengakos and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Contests and Rewards in the Homeric Epics: Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium on the Odyssey (15–19 September 2004)* (Ithaca, Greece) 101–10
- (2015) 'Aethiopsis', in M. Fantuzzi and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge) 306–17
- Revermann, M. (2006) 'The Competence of Theatre Audiences in Fifth- and Fourth-Century Athens', *JHS* 126, 99–124
- Richardson, N.J. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford)
- (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 6: Books 21–24 (Cambridge)
- (2007) 'The Homeric Hymn to Hermes', in P.F. Finglass, C. Collard and N.J. Richardson (eds.), *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford) 83–91
- (2010) *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite. Hymns 3, 4, and 5* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics) (Cambridge)
- (2011) 'Reflections of Choral Song in Early Hexameter Poetry', in L. Athanassaki and E.L. Bowie (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination* (TC Suppl. 10) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 15–31
- Richardson, S. (1990) *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville, TN)
- Ricks, C. (1976) 'Allusion: The Poet as Heir', in R.F. Brissenden and J.C. Eade (eds.), *Studies in the Eighteenth Century III* (Canberra) 209–40
- (2002) *Allusion to the Poets* (Oxford)
- Ridgway, D. (1992) *The First Western Greeks* (Cambridge)
- Rinon, Y. (2006) 'Mise en abyme and Tragic Signification in the *Odyssey*: The Three Songs of Demodocus', *Mnemosyne* 59, 208–25
- Risch, E. (1987) 'Zum Nestorbecher aus Ischia', *ZPE* 70, 1–9
- Rissman, L. (1983) *Love as War: Homeric Allusion in the Poetry of Sappho* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 157) (Königstein/Ts.)
- Ritoók, Z. (1989) 'The Views of Early Greek Epic on Poetry and Art', *Mnemosyne* 42, 331–48
- Robbins, E.I. (1990) 'The Gifts of the Gods: Pindar's Third *Pythian*', *CQ* 40, 307–18 [repr. in Robbins (2013) 175–91]
- (1993) 'The Education of Achilles', *QUCC* 45, 7–20 [repr. in Robbins (2013) 58–71]
- (1995) 'Sappho, Aphrodite, and the Muses', in *Mystery Cults in Late Antiquity. AncW* 26.2, 225–39 [repr. in Robbins (2013) 121–44]
- (2013) *Thalia Delighting in Song: Essays on Ancient Greek Poetry* (ed. B. MacLachlan) (*Phoenix* Suppl. 53) (Toronto–Buffalo, NY–London)
- Robert, C. (1920–26) *Die Griechische Heldensage*<sup>4</sup> (Vol. 2 of L. Preller *Griechische Mythologie*, rewritten by C. Robert) (Berlin)
- Robertson, N. (1980) 'Heracles' "Catabasis", *Hermes* 108, 274–300
- Rohdenberg, R. and Marks, J. (2012) 'Taphians and Thesprotians Within and Beyond the *Odyssey*', *Kyklos Volume 1 - CHS Articles online*, <https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/5192>
- Rollinger, R. (2001) 'The Ancient Greeks and the Impact of the Ancient Near East: Textual Evidence and Historical Perspective', in R.M. Whiting (ed.), *Mythology and Mythologies: Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences. Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project held in Paris, France, October 4–7, 1999* (Melammu Symposia 2) (Helsinki) 233–64
- (2015) 'Old Battles, New Horizons: The Ancient Near East and the Homeric Epics', in R. Rollinger and E. van Dongen (eds.), *Mesopotamia in the Ancient World: Impact, Continuities, Parallels* (Münster) 5–32

- Romney, J. (2011) 'The Rhetoric of Cohesion: Allusions to Homeric Heroes in Tyrtaeus' Poetry', MA Thesis, University of Victoria
- Rosen, R.M. (1990a) 'Hipponax and the Homeric Odysseus', *Eikasmos* 1, 11–25
- (1990b) 'Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's *Works and Days*', *ClAnt* 9, 99–113
- Rosenmeyer, T.G. (1969) 'The Rookie: A Reading of Pindar *Nemean* 1', *CSCA* 2, 233–46
- Rösler, W. (1980) *Dichter und Gruppe: Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur Historischen Funktion Früher Griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios* (Theorie und Geschichte der Literatur und der Schönen Künste. Texte und Abhandlungen 50) (Munich)
- (2011) 'Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit', in A. Rengakos and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Homer-Handbuch. Leben – Werk – Wirkung* (Stuttgart) 213–27
- Ross, D.O. (1975) *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome* (Cambridge–New York, NY)
- Rotstein, A. (2010) *The Idea of Iambos* (Oxford)
- Rowe, C.J. (1978) *Essential Hesiod: Theogony* 1–232, 453–733; *Works and Days* 1–307 (Bristol)
- Rubin, D.C. (1995) *Memory in Oral Traditions: The Cognitive Psychology of Epic, Ballads, and Counting-out Rhymes* (New York, NY–Oxford)
- Rüter, K. and Matthiessen, K. (1968) 'Zum Nestorbecher von Pithekussai', *ZPE* 2, 231–55
- Rutherford, I.C. (2000) 'Formulas, Voice, and Death in *Ehoie-Poetry*, the Hesiodic *Gunaikon Katalogos*, and the Odysseian *Nekuia*', in M. Depew and D. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (Cambridge, MA–London) 81–96
- (2001) *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford)
- (2012) 'The Catalogue of Women within the Greek Epic Tradition: Allusion, Intertextuality and Traditional Referentiality', in Ø. Andersen and D.T.T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge) 152–67
- (2015) 'Pindar's Cycle', in M. Fantuzzi and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge) 450–60
- Rutherford, R.B. (1986) 'The Philosophy of the *Odyssey*', *JHS* 106, 145–62 [repr. in Doherty (ed.) (2009) 155–88]
- (1991–93) 'From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*', *BICS* 38, 37–54 [repr. as R.B. Rutherford (2001)]
- (1992) *Homer: Odyssey XIX and XX* (Cambridge)
- (2001) 'From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*', in D.L. Cairns (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford) 117–46 [repr. of Rutherford (1991–93)]
- (2013) *Homer<sup>2</sup>* (1996<sup>1</sup>: Oxford) (G&R New Surveys in the Classics 41) (Cambridge)
- Sacks, R. (1987) *The Traditional Phrase in Homer: Two Studies in Form, Meaning, and Interpretation* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 14) (Leiden–New York, NY)
- Saïd, S. (1998) *Homère et l'Odysée* [tr. as Saïd (2011)] (Paris)
- (2011) *Homer and the Odyssey* [tr. of Saïd (1998) by R. Webb] (Oxford)
- Sammons, B. (2010) *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue* (Oxford)
- (2013) 'Narrative Doublets in the Epic Cycle', *AJP* 134, 529–56
- (2014) 'A Tale of Tydeus: Exemplarity and Structure in Two Homeric Insets', in C.C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Theban Resonances in Homeric Epic*. *TC* 6.2, 297–318
- (2017) *Device and Composition in the Greek Epic Cycle* (Oxford)
- Santoni, A. (1983) 'Temi e motivi di interesse socio-economico nella leggenda dei "sette sapienti"', *ASNP* 13, 91–160
- Sbardella, L. (1994) 'Tracce di un epos di Eracle nei poemi omerici', *SMEA* 33, 145–62
- Schadewaldt, W. (1965) *Von Homers Welt und Werk: Aufsätze und Auslegungen zur Homerischen Frage<sup>4</sup>* (1944<sup>1</sup>, 1951<sup>2</sup>, 1959<sup>3</sup>) (Stuttgart)
- Schein, S.L. (1984) *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad* (Berkeley, CA)



- (1999) 'Homeric Intertextuality: Two Examples', in J.N. Kazazis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Demetrios N. Maronitis* (Stuttgart) 349–56 [repr. in Schein (2016) 81–91]
- (2001) 'Herakles and Odysseus' Bow: Mythological Allusion in the *Odyssey*', in M. Païzi-Apostolopoulou (ed.), *ERANOS: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium on the Odyssey, 2–7 September 2000* (Ithaca, Greece) 395–407
- (2002) 'Mythological Allusion in the *Odyssey*', in F. Montanari and P. Ascheri (eds.), *Omero Tremila Anni Dopo* (Storia e Letteratura 210) (Rome) 85–101 [repr. in Schein (2016) 39–54]
- (2016) *Homeric Epic and Its Reception* (Oxford)
- Schenkeveld, D.M. (1992) 'Prose Usages of Ἀκούειν "To Read"', *CQ* 42, 129–41
- Schlange-Schöningen, H. (2006) 'Εχθρα πάρφασις: Odysseus, Aias und Palamedes', in A. Luther (ed.), *Geschichte und Fiktion in der Homerischen Odyssee* (Zetemata 125) (Munich) 93–105
- Schlesier, R. (2013) 'Atthis, Gyrinno, and other *Hetairai*: Female Personal Names in Sappho's Poetry', *Philologus* 157, 199–222
- Schoeck, G. (1961) *Ilias und Aithiopis: kyklische Motive in homerischer Brechung* (Zürich)
- Schorn, S. (2007) 'Chamaileon: Biographie und Schriften Περί τοῦ δεινὰ', *SCO* 53, 31–65
- Schrenk, L.P. (1994) 'Sappho Frag. 44 and the "Iliad"', *Hermes* 122, 144–50
- Schwartz, E. (ed.) (1887–91) *Scholia in Euripidem* (2 vols). Vol. 1: *Scholia in Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissas* (1887). Vol. 2: *Scholia in Hippolytum, Medeam, Alcestin, Andromacham, Rhesum, Troades* (1891) (Berlin)
- Schwinge, E.-R. (1997) 'Tyrtaios Über Seine Dichtung (Fr. 9 G.–P. = 12 W)', *Hermes* 125, 387–95
- Scodel, R.S. (1996) 'Self-correction, Spontaneity, and Orality', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Voice into Text* (Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 157) (Leiden–New York, NY–Cologne) 59–79
- (2001) 'Poetic Authority and Oral Traditions in Hesiod and Pindar', in J. Watson (ed.), *Speaking Volumes* (Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 218) (Leiden–Boston, MA) 109–38
- (2002) *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience* (Ann Arbor, MI)
- (2004) 'The Modesty of Homer', in C.J. MacKie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Context* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 5) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 248) (Leiden–Boston, MA) 1–19
- (2012) 'Hesiod and the Epic Cycle', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (TC Suppl. 12) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 501–15
- (2017a) 'Homeric Fate, Homeric Poetics', in C.C. Tsagalis and A. Markantonatos (eds.), *The Winnowing Oar - New Perspectives in Homeric Studies* (Berlin–Boston, MA) 75–94
- (2017b) 'Sappho 44 and Traditions of the Troad', Paper Presented at 'Sappho', CAMWS Meeting 2017, Kitchener, Ontario, April 5–8
- Scott, J.A. (1911) 'Repeated Verses in Homer', *AJP* 32, 313–21
- Scully, S. (1990) *Homer and the Sacred City* (Myth and Poetics) (Ithaca, NY)
- Segal, C.P. (1981) 'Myth, Cult, and Memory in Pindar's Third and Fourth Isthmian Odes', *Ramus* 10, 69–86 [repr. in Segal (1998) 229–49]
- (1986) 'Naming, Truth, and Creation in the Poetics of Pindar', *Diacritics* 16, 65–83 [repr. in Segal (1998b) 105–32]
- (1994) *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey* (Myth and Poetics) (Ithaca, NY–London)
- (1998a) 'Beauty, Desire, and Absence: Helen in Sappho, Alcaeus, and Ibycus', in *Aglaia: The Poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna* (Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches) (Lanham, MD–Oxford) 63–83

- (1998b) *Aglaia: The Poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna* (Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches) (Lanham, MD–Oxford)
- Seidensticker, B. (1978) 'Archilochus and Odysseus', *GRBS* 19, 5–22
- Selle, H. (2008) *Theognis und die Theognidea* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 95) (Berlin)
- Sens, A. (2003) 'Pleasures Recalled: A.R. 3.813–814, Asclepiades, and Homer', *HSCP* 101, 303–309
- (2006) 'Epigram at the Margins of Pastoral', in M. Fantuzzi and T.D. Papanghelis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral* (Leiden) 147–65
- Sergent, B. (2002) 'Les Phéaciens avant l'Odyssée', in A. Hurst and F. Létoublon (eds.), *La Mythologie et l'Odyssée: Hommage à Gabriel Germain: Actes du Colloque International de Grenoble, 20–22 Mai 1999* (Recherches et Rencontres 17) (Geneva) 199–222
- Severyns, A. (1928) *Le Cycle Épique dans l'École d'Aristarque* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liège) (Liège–Paris)
- Shapiro, K.D. (1988) 'Ὑμνων Θησαυρός: Pindar's Sixth Pythian Ode and the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi', *MH* 45, 1–5
- Shewan, A. (1913) 'Does the *Odyssey* imitate the *Iliad*?', *CQ* 7, 234–242
- Shey, H.J. (1976) 'Tyrtæus and the Art of Propaganda', *Arethusa* 9, 5–28
- Sider, D. (1989) 'The Blinding of Stesichorus', *Hermes* 117, 423–31
- (1991) 'Sarpedon and Nestor in Pindar, *Pythian* 3', *RhM* 134, 110–11
- Simondon, M. (1982) *La Mémoire et l'Oubli dans la Pensée Grecque jusqu'à la Fin du Ve Siècle avant J.-C. : Psychologie Archaique, Mythes et Doctrines* (Collection d'études mythologique) (Paris)
- Simpson, M. (1969) 'The Chariot and the Bow as Metaphors for Poetry in Pindar's Odes', *TAPA* 100, 437–73
- Sinclair, T.A. (1932) *Hesiod: Works and Days* (London)
- Sittl, K. (1882) *Die Wiederholungen in der Odyssee: Ein Beitrag zur Homerischen Frage* (Munich)
- Skempis, M. (2016) 'Review of Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (eds.) (2015)', *MH* 73, 223–24
- (2017) 'The riddle as self-indexing: Antiphanes, Ganymedes fr. 75 K–A', *MD* 78, 133–54
- Skempis, M. and Ziogas, I. (2009) 'Arete's Words: Etymology, *Ehoie*-Poetry and Gendered Narrative in the *Odyssey*', in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (TC Suppl. 4) (Berlin–New York, NY) 213–40
- Skinner, M.B. (2003) *Catullus in Verona: A Reading of the Elegiac Libellus, Poems 65–116* (Columbus)
- Skutsch, O. (ed.) (1985) *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford)
- Slater, N.W. (1996) 'Literacy and Old Comedy', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Voice into Text* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 157) (Leiden–New York, NY–Cologne) 99–112
- Slatkin, L.M. (1991) *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad* (Berkeley, CA–Oxford [repr. in Slatkin (2011b) 19–95])
- (2011a) 'Theban Traces at Troy', in *The Power of Thetis and Selected Essays* (Hellenic Studies 16) (Washington, D.C.) 99–119
- (2011b) *The Power of Thetis and Selected Essays* (Hellenic Studies 16) (Washington, D.C.)
- Smith, P.M. (1981) 'Aineiadai as Patrons of *Iliad* XX and the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite*', *HSCP* 85, 17–58
- Smyth, H.W. (1956) *Greek Grammar* (Revised by G.M. Messing) (Cambridge, MA)
- Snell, B., Kannicht, R. and Radt, S.L. (1971–2004) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (5 vols). Vol. 1: *Didascaliae Tragicae, Catalogi Tragicorum et Tragoediarum, Testimonia et Fragmenta Tragicorum Minorum* (ed. B. Snell, 1971<sup>1</sup>, 1986<sup>2</sup>). Vol. 2: *Fragmenta Adespota* (eds. R. Kannicht and B. Snell, 1981). Vol. 3: *Aeschylus* (ed. S. L. Radt, 1977). Vol. 4: *Sophocles* (ed. S. L. Radt, 1985<sup>1</sup>, 1999<sup>2</sup>). Vol. 5: *Euripides* (ed. R. Kannicht, 2 parts, 2004) (Göttingen)

- Snell, B. and Maehler, H. (eds.) (1987–89) *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* (2 vols). Vol. 1: *Epinicia* (eds. B. Snell and H. Maehler, 1987). Vol. 2: *Fragmenta. Indices* (ed. H. Maehler, 1989) (Leipzig)
- (eds.) (1970) *Bacchylidis Carmina cum Fragmentis* (Leipzig)
- Snodgrass, A.M. (1971) *The Dark Age of Greece: An Archaeological Survey of the Eleventh to the Eighth Centuries BC* (Edinburgh)
- (1998) *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art* (London)
- Solmsen, F. (1949) *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 30) (Ithaca, NY)
- (ed.) (1990) *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum. Fragmenta Selecta ediderunt R. Merkelbach et M.L. West*<sup>3</sup> (1970<sup>1</sup>, 1983<sup>2</sup>) (Oxford)
- Solodow, J.B. (1988) *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Chapel Hill, NC)
- Sommerstein, A.H. (ed.) (1987) *Aristophanes: Birds* (The Comedies of Aristophanes 6) (Warminster)
- Spelman, H.L. (2017) 'Sappho 44: Trojan Myth and Literary History', *Mnemosyne* 70, 740–57
- (2018a) *Pindar and the Poetics of Permanence* (Oxford)
- (2018b) 'Pindar and the Epic Cycle', *JHS* 138, 182–202
- (forthcoming) 'Alcaeus', in L.A. Swift (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Greek Lyric* (Oxford)
- Stallbaum, J.G. (ed.) (1825–26) *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* (2 vols). Vol. 1:  $\alpha - \lambda$  (1825). Vol. 2:  $\mu - \omega$  (1826) (Leipzig)
- Stamatopoulou, Z. (2013) 'Reading the *Aspis* as a Hesiodic Poem', *CP* 108, 273–85
- (2016) *Hesiod and Classical Greek Poetry: Reception and Transformation in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge)
- (2017) 'Wounding the Gods: The Mortal *Theomachos* in the *Iliad* and the Hesiodic *Aspis*', *Mnemosyne* 70, 920–38
- Stanford, W.B. (1963) *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero* (Oxford)
- Steiner, D.T. (2002) 'Indecorous Dining, Indecorous Speech: Pindar's First *Olympian* and the Poetics of Consumption', *Arethusa* 35, 297–314
- (2005) 'Nautical Matters: Hesiod's *Nautilia* and Ibycus Fragment 282 PMG', *CP* 100, 347–55
- (2007) 'Feathers Flying: Avian Poetics in Hesiod, Pindar, and Callimachus', *AJP* 128, 177–208
- (2009) 'Diverting Demons: Ritual, Poetic Mockery and the Odysseus-Iros Encounter', *ClAnt* 28, 71–100
- (2011) 'New Oil in Old Jars: Hipponax's *Lekythos*-Throw and Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1198–247', *Helios* 38, 1–25
- (2017) 'Choruses and Catalogues: The Performative and Generic Context of the Asopids in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*', in C.C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Poetry in Fragments: Studies on the Hesiodic Corpus and its Afterlife* (TC Suppl. 50) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 47–82
- Steinrück, M. (1999) 'Homer bei Sappho?', *Mnemosyne* 52, 139–49
- (2008) *The Suitors in the Odyssey: The Clash between Homer and Archilochus* (Hermeneutic Commentaries 2) (New York, NY–Oxford)
- Stenger, J. (2004) *Poetische Argumentation: Die Funktion der Gnomik in den Epinikien des Bakchylides* (Berlin–New York, NY)
- Stephens, S.A. (2015) *Callimachus: The Hymns. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford–New York, NY)
- Stewart, A.F. (1998) 'Nuggets: Mining the Texts Again', *AJA* 102, 271–82
- Steymans, H.U. (2010) 'Gilgameš im Westen', in *Gilgamesch: Ikonographie eines Helden / Gilgamesh: Epic and Iconography* (Fribourg–Göttingen) 287–345
- Stinton, T.C.W. (1976) '"Si Credere Dignum Est": Some Expressions of Disbelief in Euripides and Others', *PCPS* 22, 60–89 [repr. in Stinton (1990) 236–64]
- (1990) *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford)
- Stoevesandt, M. (2016) *Homer's Iliad: The Basel Commentary. Book VI* (Boston–Boston, MA)

- Stoneman, R. (1981) 'Pindar and the Mythological Tradition', *Philologus* 125, 44–63
- Suárez de la Torre, E. (2008) '«Ya vienen los novios»: una lectura socioantropológica del fragmento 44 V. de Safo', *Faentia* 30, 143–60
- Suter, A. (2009) 'Tragic Tears and Gender', in T. Fögen (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World* (Berlin–New York, NY) 59–83
- Swain, S.C.R. (1988) 'A Note on *Iliad* 9.524–99: The Story of Meleager', *CQ* 38, 271–76
- Sweeney, R.D. (ed.) (1997) *Lactantii Placidi in Statii Thebaida Commentum, Anonymi in Statii Achilleida Commentum, Fulgentii ut Fingitur Planciadis super Thebaiden Commentariolum* (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana) (Stuttgart)
- Swift, L.A. (2010) *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric* (Oxford Classical Monographs) (Oxford)
- (2012) 'Archilochus the "Anti-Hero"? Heroism, Flight and Values in Homer and the New Archilochus Fragment (P.Oxy LXIX 4708)', *JHS* 132, 139–55
- (2014a) 'The animal fable and Greek iambus: *ainoi* and half-*ainoi* in Archilochus', in C. Werner, B. Sebastiani and A. Dourado-Lopes (eds.), *Gêneros poéticos na Grécia antiga: Confluências e fronteiras* (São Paulo) 49–77
- (2014b) 'Telephus on Paros: Genealogy and Myth in the "New Archilochus" Poem (P Oxy. 4708)', *CQ* 64, 433–447
- (2015) 'Negotiating Seduction: Archilochus' Cologne Epode and the Transformation of Epic', *Philologus* 159, 2–28
- (ed.) (forthcoming) *Archilochus: The Poems. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford)
- Szarmach, M. (1974) 'Le mythe de Palamède avant la tragédie grecque', *Eos* 62, 35–47
- Taplin, O. (1986) 'Homer's Use of Achilles' Earlier Campaigns in the *Iliad*', in J. Boardman and C.E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), *Chios. A Conference at the Homereion in Chios 1984*. (Oxford) 15–19
- (1990) 'Agamemnon's Role in the *Iliad*', in C. Pelling (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (Oxford) 60–82
- (1992) *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad* (Oxford)
- Tarkow, T. (1983) 'Tyrtaeus 9 D.: The Role of Poetry in the New Sparta', *AC* 52, 48–69
- Tarrant, D. (1951) 'Plato's Use of Quotations and Other Illustrative Material', *CQ* 1, 59–67
- Tarrant, R.J. (ed.) (2004) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses* (Oxford)
- (2012) *Virgil: Aeneid Book XII* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics) (Cambridge)
- Taylor, M.W. (1981) *The Tyrant Slayers: The Heroic Image in Fifth Century B.C. Athenian Art and Politics* (New York, NY)
- Teodorsson, S.-T. (2006) 'Eastern Literacy, Greek Alphabet, and Homer', *Mnemosyne* 59, 161–87
- Thalmann, W.G. (1984) *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore, MD)
- (1998) *The Swineherd and the Bow: Representations of Class in the Odyssey* (Myth and Poetics) (Ithaca, NY–London)
- Thilo, G.C. and Hagen, H. (eds.) (1881–1902) *Servii Grammatici qui Feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii* (3 vols). Vol. 1: *Aeneidos Librorum I–V Commentarii* (1881). Vol. 2: *Aeneidos Librorum VI–XII Commentarii* (1883). Vol. 3, Pt. 1: *In Bucolica et Georgica Commentarii* (1887), Pt. 2: *Appendix Serviana* (1902) (Leipzig)
- Thomas, O. (2011) 'The Homeric Hymn to Pan', in A. Faulkner (ed.), *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays* (Oxford) 151–72
- (2017) 'Sparring Partners: Fraternal Relations in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes', in P. Bassino, L.G. Canavero and B. Graziosi (eds.), *Conflict and Consensus in Early Hexameter Poetry* (Cambridge) 62–83
- Thomas, R. (1992) *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Key Themes in Ancient History) (Cambridge)

- (2009) 'Writing, Reading, Public and Private "Literacies": Functional Literacy and Democratic Literacy in Greece', in W.A. Johnson and H.N. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome* (Oxford) 13–45
- Thomas, R.F. (1982) 'Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1–18)', *AJP* 103, 144–64 [repr. in Thomas (1999) 12–32]
- (1986) 'Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference', *HSCP* 90, 171–98 [repr. in Thomas (1999) 114–41]
- (1988) *Virgil: Georgics* (2 vols). (Cambridge)
- (1992) 'The Old Man Revisited: Memory, Reference and Genre in Virg., *Georg.* 4, 116–48', *MD* 29, 35–70 [repr. in Thomas (1999) 173–205]
- (1993) 'Review of Horsfall (1991)', *Vergilius* 39, 76–80
- (1998) 'Virgil's Pindar?', in P. Knox and C. Foss (eds.), *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen* (Stuttgart) 99–120 [repr. in Thomas (1999) 267–87]
- (1999) *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor, MI)
- Thornton, A. (1984) *Homer's Iliad: Its Composition and the Motif of Supplication* (Hypomnemata 81) (Göttingen)
- Thummer, E. (1968–69) *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte, Textkritisch Herausgegeben, Übersetzt und Kommentiert, mit Einer Analyse der Pindarischen Epiniken* (Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern, 2 vols) (Heidelberg)
- Tigay, J.H. (1982) *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia, PA)
- Török, L. (2014) *Herodotus in Nubia* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 368) (Leiden–Boston, MA)
- Torrance, I. (2013) *Metapoetry in Euripides* (Oxford)
- Torres-Guerra, J.B. (1995) *La Tebaida homérica como fuente de Iliada y Odisea* (Madrid)
- Townshend, J.R. (2015) 'Stop Me If You've Heard This One: Faux Alexandrian Footnotes in Vergil', *Vergilius* 61, 77–96
- Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I. (1959) 'Eine Aesopische Fabel und ihre Orientalischen Parallelen', *Acta Ant. Hung.* 7, 317–27
- Tsagalis, C.C. (2004) *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's Iliad* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 70) (Berlin)
- (2008) *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics* (Hellenic Studies 29) (Cambridge, MA–London)
- (2011) 'Towards an Oral, Intertextual Neoanalysis', *TC* 3, 209–244
- (2012) 'Deauthorizing the Epic Cycle: Odysseus' False Tale to Eumaeus (*Od.* 14.199–359)', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C.C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (TC Suppl. 12) (Berlin–Boston, MA) 309–45
- (2014) 'Preface', in C.C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Theban Resonances in Homeric Epic*. *TC* 6.2, 239–246
- (ed.) (2017) *Early Greek Epic Fragments I: Antiquarian and Genealogical Epic* (TC Suppl. 47) (Berlin–Boston, MA)
- Tsantsanoglou, K. (2008) 'Archilochus Fighting in Thasos: Frr. 93a and 94 from the Sosthenes Inscription', in D. Katsonopoulou, I. Petropoulos and S. Katsarou (eds.), *Archilochus and his Age. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades* (Athens) 163–80
- Tsomis, G. (2001) *Zusammenschau der Frühgriechischen Monodischen Melik: Alkaïos, Sappho, Anakreon* (Paligenesia 70) (Stuttgart)
- Uhlig, A.S. (2018) 'Sailing and Singing: Alcaeus at Sea', in F. Budelmann and T. Phillips (eds.), *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece* (Oxford) 63–91
- Usener, K. (1990) *Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis der Odyssee zur Ilias* (ScriptOralia 21) (Tübingen)
- de Vaan, M. (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and The Other Italic Languages* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series) (Leiden–Boston, MA)

- van der Valk, M.H.A.L.H. (ed.) (1971–87) *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes* (4 vols). Vol. 1: *Commentarii ad Libros A – Δ* (1971). Vol. 2: *Commentarii ad Libros E – I* (1976). Vol. 3: *Commentarii ad Libros K – Π* (1979). Vol. 4: *Commentarii ad Libros P – Ω* (1987) (Leiden)
- (1958) 'On Apollodori *Bibliotheca*', *REG* 71, 100–168
- Van Sickel, J. (1975) 'The New Erotic Fragment of Archilochus', *QUCC* 20, 123–56
- Van Tress, H. (2004) *Poetic Memory: Allusion in the Poetry of Callimachus and the Metamorphoses of Ovid* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 258) (Leiden)
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1986) 'Some Remarks on Cuneiform *écritures*', in H.L.J. Vanstiphout, K. Jongeling, F. Leemhuis and G.J. Reinink (eds.), *Scripta Signa Vocis: Studies about Scripts, Scriptures, Scribes and Languages in the Near East, Presented to J. H. Hospers by his Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends* (Groningen) 217–34
- Vecchiato, S. (2016) 'Osservazioni critiche su un frammento epico adespoto (7 D. = SH 1168)', *Lexis* 34, 181–95
- Verdenius, W.J. (1983) 'The Principles of Greek Literary Criticism', *Mnemosyne* 36, 14–59
- Vergados, A. (2013) *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Texte und Kommentare 41) (Berlin)
- (2014) 'Form and Function of Some Theban Resonances in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*', in C.C. Tsagalis (ed.), *Theban Resonances in Homeric Epic*. TC 6.2, 437–451
- Vernant, J.-P. (1969) *Mythe et Pensée chez les Grecs: Études de Psychologie Historique*<sup>2</sup> (1965<sup>1</sup>) [tr. as Vernant (1983)] (Paris)
- (1974) *Mythe et Société en Grèce Ancienne* [tr. as Vernant (1980)] (Paris)
- (1980) *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece* [tr. of Vernant (1974) by J. Lloyd] (European Philosophy and the Human Sciences) (Brighton–Atlantic Highlands, NJ)
- (1983) *Myth and Thought among the Greeks* [tr. of Vernant (1969)] (London)
- Verzina, P. (2014) 'Achilles at Scyros and the *Cypria*: Tradition And Myth in the *Epic Cycle*', *Kyklos* 2, *Classics@*, <https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/5677>
- Vetta, M. (1980) *Theognis: Elegiarum Liber Secundus* (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 5) (Rome)
- (1982) 'Il P. Oxy. 2506 fr. 77 e la poesia pederotica di Alceo', *QUCC* 10, 7–20
- Vian, F. (ed.) (1976–81) *Apollonios de Rhodes: Argonautiques* (3 vols). Vol. 1: *Chants I–II* (1976). Vol. 2: *Chant III* (1980). Vol. 3: *Chant IV* (1981) (Paris)
- Vogelzang, M.E. and Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.) (1992) *Mesopotamian Epic Literature, Oral or Aural?* (Lewiston, NY)
- Voigt, E.-M. (ed.) (1971) *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta* (Amsterdam)
- Wachter, R. (2006) 'Nestor Cup', in H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's New Pauly: Antiquity*. Vol.9: *Mini-Obe* (Leiden) coll.683–84
- (2010) 'The Origin of Epigrams on "Speaking Objects"', in M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (Cambridge) 250–60
- Wallace, R.W. (1989) 'ΟΡΘΟΡΟΣ', *TAPA* 119, 201–7
- Walsh, G.B. (1984) *The Varieties of Enchantment: Early Greek Views of the Nature and Function of Poetry* (Chapel Hill, NC)
- Watkins, C. (1976) 'Observations on the "Nestor's Cup" Inscription', *HSCP* 80, 25–40
- (1995) *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York, NY–Oxford)
- Weitzmann, K. (1959) *Ancient Book Illumination* (Martin Classical Lectures 16) (Cambridge, MA)
- Welcker, F.G. (1865–82) *Der Epische Cyclus, oder Die Homerischen Dichter*<sup>2</sup> (2 vols). Vol. 1 (1835<sup>1</sup>, 1865<sup>2</sup>). Vol. 2: *Die Gedichte nach Inhalt und Composition* (1849<sup>1</sup> 1882<sup>2</sup>) (Bonn)
- Wendel, C.T.E. (ed.) (1914) *Scholia in Theocritum Vetera* (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana) (Leipzig)

- West, M.L. (1966) *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford)
- (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 14) (Berlin–New York, NY)
- (1978) *Hesiod: Works & Days* (Oxford)
- (1982) *Greek Metre* (Oxford)
- (1984a) 'New Fragments of Ibycus' Love Songs', *ZPE* 57, 23–32
- (1984b) 'The Ascription of Fables to Aesop in Archaic and Classical Greece', in F.R. Adrados and O. Reverdin (eds.), *La Fable: Huit Exposés Suivis de Discussions* (Entretiens sur L'Antiquité Classique 30) (Geneva) 105–36 [repr. in M.L. West (2011–13) III. 396–415]
- (1985) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins* (Oxford)
- (1987) *Euripides: Orestes* (Warminster)
- (ed.) (1989–92) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*<sup>2</sup> (2 vols). Vol.1: Archilochus, Hipponax, Theognidea (1971<sup>1</sup>, 1989<sup>2</sup>). Vol.2: Callinus, Mimnermus, Semonides, Solon, Tyrtaeus, Minora Adespota (1972<sup>1</sup>, 1992<sup>2</sup>) (Oxford)
- (1992) *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford)
- (1995) 'The Date of the *Iliad*', *MH* 52, 203–19 [repr. in M.L. West (2011–13) I. 188–208]
- (1997) *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford)
- (ed.) (1998–2000) *Homeri Ilias* (2 vols). Vol. 1: *Rhapsodias I – XII Continens* (1998). Vol. 2: *Rhapsodias XIII – XXIV et Indicem Nominum Continens* (2000) (Leipzig)
- (1999) 'The Invention of Homer', *CQ* 49, 364–82 [repr. in M.L. West (2011–13) I. 408–36]
- (2002) 'The View from Lesbos', in M. Reichel and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Epea pteroenta: Beiträge zur Homerforschung: Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart) 207–19 [repr. in M.L. West (2011–13) I. 392–407]
- (ed.) (2003a) *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer* (Loeb Classical Library 496) (Cambridge MA–London)
- (ed.) (2003b) *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Loeb Classical Library 497) (Cambridge, MA–London)
- (2003c) '*Iliad* and *Aethiopis*', *CQ* 53, 1–14 [repr. in M.L. West (2011–13) I. 242–64]
- (2005a) 'The New Sappho', *ZPE* 151, 1–9 [repr. in M.L. West (2011–13) II. 53–66]
- (2005b) '*Odyssey* and *Argonautica*', *CQ* 55, 39–64 [repr. in M.L. West (2011–13) I. 277–312]
- (2006) 'Archilochus and Telephos', *ZPE* 156, 11–17 [repr. in M.L. West (2011–13) II. 6–16]
- (2007) *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford)
- (2011a) *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary* (Oxford)
- (2011b) 'Pindar as a Man of Letters', in D. Obbink and R.B. Rutherford (eds.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford) 50–68 [repr. in M.L. West (2011–13) II. 129–50]
- (2011c) 'Echoes of Hesiod and Elegy in the *Iliad*', in *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought*. Vol. I: *Epic* (Oxford) 209–32
- (2011–13) *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought* (3 vols). Vol. 1: *Epic*. Vol. 2: *Lyric and Drama*. Vol. 3: *Philosophy, Music and Metre, Literary Byways, Varia* (Oxford)
- (2012) 'Towards a Chronology of Early Greek Epic', in Ø. Andersen and D.T.T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge–New York, NY) 224–41
- (2013) *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford)
- (2014a) *The Making of the Odyssey* (New York, NY–Oxford)
- (2014b) 'Nine Poems of Sappho', *ZPE* 191, 1–12
- (2015) 'Epic, Lyric, and Lyric Epic', in P.J. Finglass and A. Kelly (eds.), *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge) 63–80
- (ed.) (2017) *Homerus: Odyssea* (Berlin–Boston, MA)

- (2018) 'Gilgāmeš and Homer: The Missing Link?', in L. Audley-Miller and B. Dignas (eds.), *Wandering Myths: Transcultural Uses of Myth in the Ancient World* (Berlin–Boston) 265–80
- West, S.R. (1981) 'An Alternative Nostos for Odysseus', *LCM* 6, 169–75
- (1988) 'Books I–IV', in A. Heubeck, S.R. West and J.B. Hainsworth (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. 1: *Introduction and Books I–VIII* (Oxford) 49–245
- (1994) 'Nestor's Bewitching Cup', *ZPE* 101, 9–15
- (2012) 'Odyssean stratigraphy', in Ø. Andersen and D.T.T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge) 122–37
- Westlake, H.D. (1977) 'Λέγεται in Thucydides', *Mnemosyne* 30, 345–62
- Whitman, C.H. (1958) *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (Cambridge, MA)
- Whitmarsh, T.J.G. (2004) 'The Harvest of Wisdom: Landscape, Description, and Identity in the *Heroikos*', in J.K.B. Maclean and E.B. Aitken (eds.), *Philostratus's Heroikos: Religion and Cultural Identity in the Third Century C.E.* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 6) (Leiden) 237–49
- (2018) 'Sappho and Cyborg Helen', in F. Budelmann and T. Phillips (eds.), *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece* (Oxford) 135–49
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1884) *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Philologische Untersuchungen 7) (Berlin)
- (1886) *Isyllos von Epidauros* (Philologische Untersuchungen 9) (Berlin)
- (1908) 'Pindars siebentes nemeisches Gedicht', *SPAW* 15, 328–52
- (1922) *Pindaros* (Berlin)
- Wilkinson, C.L. (2013) *The Lyric of Ibycus: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Sozomena 13) (Berlin–Boston, MA)
- Willcock, M.M. (1964) 'Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*', *CQ* 14, 141–54 [repr. in Cairns (ed.) (2001) 435–55]
- (1973) 'The Funeral Games of Patroclus', *BICS* 20, 1–11
- (1977) 'Ad Hoc Invention in the *Iliad*', *HSCP* 81, 41–53
- (1983) 'Antilochus in the *Iliad*', in *Mélanges E. Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence–Marseille) 477–85
- (1995) *Pindar: Victory Odes*. Olympians 2, 7, and 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, and 7 (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics) (Cambridge)
- (1997) 'Neanalysis', in I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 163) (Leiden) 174–89
- Williams, R.J. (1956) 'The Literary History of a Mesopotamian Fable', *Phoenix* 10, 70–77
- Willigers, S. (2017) 'Narrative Authority: From Epic to Drama', PhD thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam
- Willink, C.W. (1971) 'The Prologue of *Iphigenia at Aulis*', *CQ* 21, 343–64
- Wills, J. (1996) *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford)
- Wilson, D.F. (2002) 'Lion Kings: Heroes in the Epic Mirror', *ColbyQ* 38, 231–54
- (2005) 'Demodokos' *Iliad* and Homer's', in R.J. Rabel (ed.), *Approaches to Homer, Ancient & Modern* (Swansea–Oakville, CT) 1–20
- Wilson, N.G. (ed.) (2007) *Aristophanis Fabulae* (2 vols). Vol. 1: *Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes, Vespae, Pax, Aves*. Vol. 2: *Lysistrata, Thesmophoriazusae, Ranae, Ecclesiazusae, Plutus* (Oxford)
- (ed.) (2015) *Herodoti Historiae* (2 vols). Vol. 1: *Libri I–IV*. Vol. 2: *Libri V–IX* (Oxford)
- Woodbury, L.E. (1968) 'Pindar and the Mercenary Muse: *Isthm.* 2.1–13', *TAPA* 99, 527–42 [repr. in Woodbury (1991) 188–200]
- (1991) *Collected Writings* (eds. C.G. Brown, R.L. Fowler, E.I. Robbins, and P.M.W. Matheson) (Scholars Press Homage Series) (Atlanta, GA)
- Wright, G.M. and Jones, P.V. (1997) *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation* (Oxford)
- Wright, M.E. (2005) *Euripides' Escape-Tragedies: A Study of Helen, Andromeda, and Iphigenia among the Taurians* (Oxford–New York, NY)



- (2006a) 'Cyclops and the Euripidean tetralogy', *CCJ* 52, 23–48
- (2006b) 'Orestes, a Euripidean Sequel', *CQ* 56, 33–47
- (2010) 'The Tragedian as Critic: Euripides and Early Greek Poetics', *JHS* 130, 165–184
- (2012) *The Comedian as Critic: Greek Old Comedy and Poetics* (London)
- (2016) *The Lost Plays of Greek Tragedy. Volume 1: Neglected Authors* (London)
- Xenis, G.A. (ed.) (2010a) *Scholia Vetera in Sophoclis 'Electram'* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 12) (Berlin–Boston, MA)
- (ed.) (2010b) *Scholia Vetera in Sophoclis 'Trachinias'* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 13) (Berlin, Boston)
- (ed.) (2018) *Scholia Vetera in Sophoclis 'Oedipum Coloneum'* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 18) (Berlin–Boston, MA)
- Xian, R. (2018) 'A Note on ἀγοράν in Pindar N. 3.14', *Mnemosyne* 71, 169–72
- (forthcoming) 'κλέος ἄφθιτον in Sappho fr. 44.4 V', *Hermes*
- Yamagata, N. (2012) 'Use of Homeric References in Plato and Xenophon', *CQ* 62, 130–144
- Yasumura, N. (2011) *Challenges to the Power of Zeus in Early Greek Poetry* (London)
- Yatromanolakis, D. (2007) *Sappho in the Making: The Early Reception* (Cambridge, MA–London)
- Ypsilanti, M. (2009) 'οὐκ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος: Callimachus' use of the story of Melanippe in his *Bath of Pallas*', *QUCC* 92, 105–17
- Yunis, H. (ed.) (2003) *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge)
- Zarecki, J.P. (2007) 'Pandora and the Good Eris in Hesiod', *GRBS* 47, 5–29
- Ziogas, I. (2013) *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of The Catalogue of Women* (Cambridge–New York, NY)
- Zogg, F. (2014) *Lust am Lesen. Literarische Anspielungen im Frieden des Aristophanes* (Zetemata 147) (Munich)